arXiv:1603.01355v1 [math.AP] 4 Mar 2016

Convergence of the Lawrence-Doniach Energy for Layered Superconductors with Magnetic Fields near H_{c_1}

Guanying Peng*

March 7, 2016

Abstract

We analyze minimizers of the Lawrence-Doniach energy for three-dimensional highly anisotropic superconductors with layered structure. For such a superconductor occupying a bounded generalized cylinder in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with equally spaced parallel layers, we assume an applied magnetic field that is perpendicular to the layers with intensity $h_{ex} \sim |\ln \epsilon|$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, where ϵ is the reciprocal of the Ginzburg-Landau parameter. We prove compactness results for various physical quantities of energy minimizers, and derive a Gamma-limit of the Lawrence-Doniach energy as ϵ and the interlayer distance s tend to zero, under the additional assumption that the layers are weakly coupled (i.e., $s \gg \epsilon$).

1 Introduction

This paper is devoted to the analysis of the Lawrence-Doniach model (with energy given by (1.1)) for three-dimensional highly anisotropic superconductors with layered structure. Such discrete structure is common in high temperature superconductors (e.g., the cuprates). Because of the discrete layered structure, these superconductors exhibit very different material properties than isotropic superconductors, which can be well described by the celebrated Ginzburg-Landau model. (See the survey [15] for a physical discussion on layered superconductors.) The Lawrence-Doniach model was proposed by Lawrence and Doniach [18] in 1971 as an alternative model to account for the anisotropy in layered superconductors. Unlike the Ginzburg-Landau model, which describes a superconductor as a continuous three-dimensional solid, the Lawrence-Doniach model treats the superconducting material as a stack of parallel superconducting layers with nonlinear Josephson coupling between them. It is generally considered a more complete theory for layered superconductors than other models (e.g., the anisotropic Ginzburg-Landau model).

1.1 The energy functional

We first recall the two-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau energy with magnetic fields. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded simply connected smooth domain. Then the two-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau energy with magnetic fields is given by

$$F_\epsilon(u, A) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla_A u|^2 + \frac{\left(1 - |u|^2\right)^2}{2\epsilon^2} \right] dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \left(\mathrm{curl} A - h_{ex}\right)^2 dx.$$

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA. E-mail: penggg@ucmail.uc.edu.

Here the first unknown $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ is the complex valued order parameter, whose modulus, $|u(x)|$, represents the density of superconducting electron pairs at the point x. For a minimizer of F_ϵ, $|u(x)| \sim 1$ corresponds to a superconducting state at x, whereas $|u(x)| = 0$ corresponds to a normal (nonsuperconducting) state at x. The second unknown $A = (A_1, A_2) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is the magnetic potential, whose two-dimensional curl, $\mathrm{curl} A = \partial_1 A_2 - \partial_2 A_1$, represents the induced magnetic field. The parameter $\epsilon > 0$ is the reciprocal of the Ginzburg-Landau parameter κ, and $h_{ex} > 0$ represents the strength of the applied magnetic field. We set $\nabla_A u = \nabla u - \imath A u$ on Ω. The above energy F_ϵ represents the free energy of a cross-section of an infinitely long cylinder shaped superconductor subject to an applied magnetic field of intensity h_{ex} that is perpendicular to the cross-section.

In this paper, we focus on the Lawrence-Doniach model. For some fixed $L > 0$ and a bounded simply connected smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we denote $D = \Omega \times (0, L)$, which is the bounded open cylinder in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with cross-section Ω and height L. We consider a layered superconductor occupying $\overline{D}$ with $N + 1$ equally spaced layers of material occupying $\Omega_n = \Omega \times \{ns\}$, where $s = \frac{L}{N}$ is the interlayer distance. Assuming an applied magnetic field $h_{ex}\vec{e}_3$ which is perpendicular to the layers, the Lawrence-Doniach energy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^{\epsilon,s}_{LD}(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A}) = {} & s \sum_{n=0}^{N} \int_\Omega \left[\frac{1}{2} |\hat{\nabla}_{\hat{A}_n} u_n|^2 + \frac{(1 - |u_n|^2)^2}{4\epsilon^2} \right] d\hat{x} \\ & + s \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2\lambda^2 s^2} \left| u_{n+1} - u_n e^{\imath \int_{ns}^{(n+1)s} A^3 dx_3} \right|^2 d\hat{x} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left| \nabla \times \vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{e}_3 \right|^2 dx \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

for $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \{u_n\}_{n=0}^N \in [H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \quad \text{and} \\ \vec{A} \in E := \{\vec{C} \in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3) : (\nabla \times \vec{C}) - h_{ex}\vec{e}_3 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)\}. \end{cases}$$

Similar to the Ginzburg-Landau energy, the first unknown $u_n : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ is the complex valued order parameter on the nth layer, and the second unknown $\vec{A} = (A^1, A^2, A^3) : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ is the magnetic potential, whose three-dimensional curl, $\nabla \times \vec{A} = (\partial_2 A^3 - \partial_3 A^2, \partial_3 A^1 - \partial_1 A^3, \partial_1 A^2 - \partial_2 A^1)$, is the induced magnetic field. The material parameter $\lambda > 0$ represents the Josephson penetration depth, which is assumed to be fixed in this study. Throughout, we use $\hat{(\cdot)}$ to denote two-dimensional vectors and operators. For example, we denote $\hat{x} = (x_1, x_2)$, $\hat{\nabla} = (\partial_1, \partial_2)$, $\hat{A} = (A^1, A^2)$ and $\hat{A}_n(\hat{x}) = (A^1(\hat{x}, ns), A^2(\hat{x}, ns))$, the trace of $\hat{A}$ on the nth layer.

For the above models with magnetic fields, the behavior of energy minimizers is largely determined by the values of h_{ex} versus ϵ. Namely, there are two critical values of h_{ex}, denoted by $H_{c_1} \sim |\ln \epsilon|$ and $H_{c_3} \sim \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$, at which the superconductor undergoes phase transitions from the superconducting state to the mixed state (coexistence of superconducting and normal states), and from the mixed state to the normal state, respectively. One of the central questions is to understand the vortex structure for minimizers with the strength of the magnetic field in different regimes. (A *vortex* is an isolated zero of the order parameter u, around which u has a nonzero winding number, called the *degree of the vortex*.) For the underlying two-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau energy, the behavior of energy minimizers and their vortex structure in an applied magnetic field with modulus h_{ex} in different regimes (e.g., $h_{ex} \sim |\ln \epsilon|, |\ln \epsilon| \ll h_{ex} \ll \epsilon^{-2}$, or $h_{ex} \geq \frac{C}{\epsilon^2}$) are now well understood. (See the book [21] and the references therein, and also [17] and [13].) Recently, Γ-convergence results for the three-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau model in different energy regimes were obtained by Baldo et al. [6]. For the Lawrence-Doniach energy, an analysis of minimizers for h_{ex} in the first two regimes

has been done by Alama et al. [1] under certain periodicity assumptions. They also studied the cases when the magnetic fields are parallel to the layers or oblique in [1] and [2]. Without the additional periodicity assumptions, Bauman and the author [9] proved an asymptotic formula for the minimum Lawrence-Doniach energy with $|\ln\epsilon| \ll h_{ex} \ll \epsilon^{-2}$ in the limiting case as $(\epsilon, s) \to (0,0)$, and obtained vortex structure information in this case. In the last regime, $h_{ex} \geq \frac{C}{\epsilon^2}$, it was shown by Bauman-Ko [8] that if C is sufficiently large, all minimizers of the Lawrence-Doniach energy are in the normal phase. A similar result is known for the two-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau energy. (See [13].) The goal of this paper is to investigate the limiting behavior of the Lawrence-Doniach energy with the intensity of the magnetic field in the regime $h_{ex} \sim |\ln\epsilon|$ without the additional periodicity assumptions.

Since $\vec{A} \in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$, by the trace theorem and the Sobolev embedding theorem, we have $\hat{A}_n \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{R}^2) \subset L^4_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{R}^2)$. Therefore, the Lawrence-Doniach energy $\mathcal{G}^{\epsilon,s}_{LD}(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A})$ is well-defined and finite. The existence of minimizers in the admissible space $[H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \times E$ was shown by Chapman et al. [10]. The minimizer satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equations associated to the Lawrence-Doniach energy given by

$$\begin{cases} (\hat{\nabla} - \imath\hat{A}_n)^2 u_n + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}(1-|u_n|^2)u_n + P_n = 0 & \text{on } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times (\nabla \times \vec{A}) = (j_1, j_2, j_3) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3, \\ (\hat{\nabla} - \imath\hat{A}_n)u_n \cdot \vec{n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \nabla \times \vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{e}_3 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3) \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

for all $n = 0, 1, \cdots, N$, where

$$P_n = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda^2 s^2}(u_1 \bar{\Upsilon}^1_0 - u_0) & \text{if } n = 0, \\ \frac{1}{\lambda^2 s^2}(u_{n+1}\bar{\Upsilon}^{n+1}_n + u_{n-1}\Upsilon^n_{n-1} - 2u_n) & \text{if } 0 < n < N, \\ \frac{1}{\lambda^2 s^2}(u_{N-1}\Upsilon^N_{N-1} - u_N) & \text{if } n = N, \end{cases}$$

$$\Upsilon^{n+1}_n = e^{\imath \int_{ns}^{(n+1)s} A^3 dx_3} \quad \text{for } n = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} j_i &= -s\sum_{n=0}^{N} (\partial_i u_n - \imath A^i_n u_n, -\imath u_n)\chi_\Omega(x_1,x_2)dx_1dx_2\delta_{ns}(x_3) \quad \text{for } i = 1,2, \\ j_3 &= s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\lambda^2 s^2}(u_{n+1} - u_n\Upsilon^{n+1}_n, \imath u_n \Upsilon^{n+1}_n)\chi_\Omega(x_1,x_2)\chi_{[ns,(n+1)s]}(x_3). \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

We say that two configurations $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A})$ and $(\{v_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{B})$ in $[H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \times E$ are gauge-equivalent if there exists a function $g \in H^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} u_n(\hat{x}) = v_n(\hat{x})e^{\imath g(\hat{x},ns)} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \vec{A} = \vec{B} + \nabla g & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3. \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

By direct calculations, one can check that $\mathcal{G}^{\epsilon,s}_{LD}$ (and each term in $\mathcal{G}^{\epsilon,s}_{LD}$) is invariant under the above gauge transformation, i.e., for two configurations $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A})$ and $(\{v_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{B})$ that are related by (1.4), we have $\mathcal{G}^{\epsilon,s}_{LD}(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A}) = \mathcal{G}^{\epsilon,s}_{LD}(\{v_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{B})$. Let $\vec{a} = \vec{a}(x)$ be any fixed smooth vector field on $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\nabla \times \vec{a} = \vec{e}_3$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Throughout this paper, we take $\vec{a}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(-x_2, x_1, 0)$. Define the space $\check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$ to be the completion of $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$ with respect to the seminorm

$$\|\vec{C}\|_{\check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)} = \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla\vec{C}|^2 dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

From [8], each $\vec{C} \in \check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$ has a representative in $L^6(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\|\vec{C}\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)} \le 2\|\vec{C}\|_{\check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)}, \tag{1.5}$$

and

$$\|\vec{C}\|^2_{\check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\nabla \cdot \vec{C}|^2 + |\nabla \times \vec{C}|^2) dx. \tag{1.6}$$

Define the space K to be

$$K := \{\vec{C} \in E : \nabla \cdot \vec{C} = 0 \text{ and } \vec{C} - h_{ex}\vec{a} \in \check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3) \cap L^6(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)\}.$$

It was proved by Bauman-Ko [8] that every pair $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A}) \in [H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \times E$ is gauge-equivalent to another pair $(\{v_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{B}) \in [H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \times K$. In particular, any minimizer of $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$ in the admissible space $[H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \times E$ is gauge-equivalent to a minimizer in the space $[H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \times K$, called the "Coulomb gauge" for $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$. It was also shown in [8] that a minimizer $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A})$ of $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$ satisfies $|u_n| \le 1$ a.e. in Ω, and that a minimizer in the Coulomb gauge satisfies $u_n \in C^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ and $\hat{A}_n \in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $n = 0, 1, \cdots, N$.

1.2 Statement of the main results

To state our main results, let us introduce some notations. Following notations in [16], for a function $u \in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$, we define the *current* $j(u)$ and the *Jacobian* $J(u)$ to be

$$j(u) = (\imath u, \hat{\nabla} u), \quad J(u) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{curl} j(u),$$

respectively. Here $(\imath u, \hat{\nabla} u)$ is a real vector in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with components $(\imath u, \partial_j u)$ for $j = 1, 2$, where $(a+\imath b, c+\imath d) = ac+bd$ for two complex numbers $a+\imath b$ and $c+\imath d$. For the two-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau energy, the Jacobian carries important topological information of vortices (e.g., degree and location). For a configuration $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A}) \in [H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \times E$, we define the discrete version of the current and the Jacobian as

$$j^{\epsilon,s}(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u_n)\chi_n(x_3), \quad J^{\epsilon,s}(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} J(u_n)\chi_n(x_3), \tag{1.7}$$

respectively, where

$$\chi_n(x_3) = \begin{cases} \chi_{(0,s)}(x_3) & \text{for } n = 0, \\ \chi_{[ns,(n+1)s)}(x_3) & \text{for } n = 1, \cdots, N-1. \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

Given some constant $h_0 \ge 0$, we define spaces E_0 and K_0 that are parallel to E and K. More precisely, let

$$E_0 := \{\vec{C} \in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3) : (\nabla \times \vec{C}) - h_0\vec{e}_3 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)\},$$

and

$$K_0 := \{\vec{C} \in E_0 : \nabla \cdot \vec{C} = 0 \text{ and } \vec{C} - h_0\vec{a} \in \check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3) \cap L^6(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)\}. \tag{1.9}$$

Let $\mathcal{M}(D)$ be the space of finite Radon measures. Also we define the space

$$V := \{v \in L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2) : \mathrm{curl} v \in \mathcal{M}(D)\}. \tag{1.10}$$

For a pair $(v, \vec{A}) \in L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2) \times E_0$, we define the energy functional

$$\mathcal{G}_{h_0}(v, \vec{A}) := \frac{1}{2}\left[\| v - \hat{A} \|^2_{L^2(D)} + |\mathrm{curl} v|(D) + \| \nabla \times \vec{A} - h_0\vec{e}_3 \|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}\right], \tag{1.11}$$

where $|\mathrm{curl} v|(D)$ denotes the total variation of the Radon measure $\mathrm{curl} v$, with the convention to understand $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}(v, \vec{A})$ equal to $+\infty$ if $\mathrm{curl} v \notin \mathcal{M}(D)$. Our main result is the following Γ-convergence of the Lawrence-Doniach energy:

Theorem 1. *Assume* $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{h_{ex}}{|\ln\epsilon|} = h_0$ *for some* $0 \le h_0 < \infty$. *Let* $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A})$ *be minimizers of* $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$ *in* $[H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \times K$.

(Compactness) *Up to a subsequence as* $(\epsilon, s) \to (0,0)$, *we have*

$$\frac{j^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln\epsilon|} \rightharpoonup v_0 \text{ in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2), \quad \frac{J^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln\epsilon|} \rightharpoonup w_0 \text{ in } (C_c^{0,\alpha}(D))^* \text{ for all } 0 < \alpha \le 1, \tag{1.12}$$

and

$$\frac{\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a}}{|\ln\epsilon|} \rightharpoonup \vec{A}_0 - h_0\vec{a} \quad \text{in } \check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3) \tag{1.13}$$

for some $v_0 \in L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$ *such that* $w_0 = \frac{1}{2} curl v_0$ *is a Radon measure, and for some* $\vec{A}_0 \in h_0\vec{a} + \check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$.

If, in addition, we assume that

$$s|\ln\epsilon| \to \infty \tag{1.14}$$

as $(\epsilon, s) \to (0,0)$, *then we have*

(Lower bound)

$$\liminf_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} \frac{\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A})}{|\ln\epsilon|^2} \ge \mathcal{G}_{h_0}(v_0, \vec{A}_0). \tag{1.15}$$

(Upper bound) *Given a minimizer* $(v_0, \vec{A}_0) \in V \times K_0$ *of* $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$, *there exists a sequence* $(\{u_n^{\epsilon,s}\}, \vec{A}^{\epsilon,s})$ *satisfying the compactness results* (1.12)-(1.13). *Furthermore, we have*

$$\limsup_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} \frac{\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}(\{u_n^{\epsilon,s}\}, \vec{A}^{\epsilon,s})}{|\ln\epsilon|^2} \le \mathcal{G}_{h_0}(v_0, \vec{A}_0). \tag{1.16}$$

Note that the regime for h_{ex} under consideration is a lot more subtle than the higher regime studied in [9], since for the regime $h_{ex} \sim |\ln\epsilon|$, the superconductor undergoes a phase transition from the superconducting state to the mixed state. Theorem 1 generalizes a result of Alama et al. [1], in which the Lawrence-Doniach energy is minimized among configurations whose gauge-invariant quantities are periodic with respect to a given parallelepiped. In that case, the periodicity assumptions simplify the problem significantly. Namely, it was proved that, for a minimizer of the gauge periodic problem, the order parameters u_n are all equal and A^3 is identically zero. In particular, the Josephson coupling term

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2\lambda^2 s^2} \left| u_{n+1} - u_n e^{\imath \int_{ns}^{(n+1)s} A^3 dx_3} \right|^2 d\hat{x} \tag{1.17}$$

vanishes. As a result, the Lawrence-Doniach energy reduces to a sum of copies of the two-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau energies on the layers. In our more general case without the periodicity assumptions, such dimension reduction techniques do not work.

Theorem 1 also extends the Γ-convergence results on the two-dimensional (see [19] and [17]) and three-dimensional (see [6]) Ginzburg-Landau models to the Lawrence-Doniach model. Our results are parallel to those on the former. Here, the Γ-limit $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$ defined in (1.11) differs from those for the

Ginzburg-Landau models, in that $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$ includes both two-dimensional (terms involving v) and three-dimensional (terms involving $\vec{A}$) functions. In particular, the limiting Jacobian, curl$v$, is a scalar valued measure and does not include the x_3 derivative of v. Therefore, our problem has features of both the two-dimensional and three-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau models. Nevertheless, the Lawrence-Doniach model shares more features with the three-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau model. Indeed, for the Ginzburg-Landau models with magnetic fields in the regime considered here, through a convex duality argument, one can rewrite the minimization of the limiting energy functional in the form of a constrained minimization problem of obstacle type (see [19], [17] and [7]). A major difference between the two-dimensional and three-dimensional cases is that, in the latter case, the obstacle becomes nonlocal. This makes the analysis of the three-dimensional obstacle type problem much more challenging than its two-dimensional counterpart. (See [7] for more details.) Our problem of minimization of the limiting functional $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$ also corresponds to a nonlocal obstacle problem. A recent work of Athavale et al. [5] includes detailed discussions on the minimization of energy functionals involving total variation measures.

Our Γ-convergence in Theorem 1 relies on the extra assumption (1.14), which makes the Lawrence-Doniach model in the extremely discrete scenario. Note that this assumption is only used to guarantee that the energy from the Josephson coupling term (1.17) with a scaling factor $|\ln\epsilon|^2$ converges to zero in the limit. In some sense, the assumption (1.14) imposes a weak coupling condition between adjacent layers in the Lawrence-Doniach model. Nevertheless, the regime under consideration is an interesting regime. In fact, when $s \ll \epsilon$, it is expected that the Lawrence-Doniach model converges, in some sense, to an anisotropic Ginzburg-Landau model (see [10] and [8]), which is not significantly different from the standard Ginzburg-Landau model in certain aspects. The assumption (1.14) is a key factor that leads to the mixture of two-dimensional and three-dimensional terms in the limiting functional $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$, and consequently, that makes the problem more different from the three-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau model. It is not clear to the author whether or not the limiting functional $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$ derived in Theorem 1 also serves as the Γ-limit of $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$ with ϵ and s in other regimes, especially when $s \ll \epsilon$.

The proof of the compactness and lower bound in Theorem 1 uses a standard slicing argument that has been used by Jerrard-Soner [16] and Sandier-Serfaty [20] for the Ginzburg-Landau functional in higher dimensions. A key point is to use small balls to cover the Jacobian in order to separate the energy contribution of the Jacobian from that of the other terms (see Lemma 3.4).

The proof of the upper bound is a lot more involved. In Section 4, we construct the order parameters $\{u_n\}$ on the layers. Essentially, on each layer, we follow the construction of test functions for the two-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau energy used in [19] and [17]. Here an extra level of subtlety comes from the limiting process as the interlayer distance s approaches zero, which creates some extra technical difficulties. In Section 5, we construct the magnetic potential $\vec{A}$ by slightly modifying that of the minimizer of the limiting functional $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$.

As a consequence of Theorem 1, we have the following

Corollary 1. *Assume* $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{h_{ex}}{|\ln\epsilon|} = h_0$ *for some* $0 \le h_0 < \infty$. *Let* $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A})$ *be minimizers of* $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$ *in* $[H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1}\times K$. *Under the assumption* (1.14), *up to a subsequence, we have*

$$\nabla\times\left(\nabla\times\frac{\vec{A}}{|\ln\epsilon|}\right) \rightharpoonup \big((v_0^1 - A_0^1)\chi_D, (v_0^2 - A_0^2)\chi_D, 0\big) \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$$

as $(\epsilon, s)\to(0,0)$, *where* χ_D *is the characteristic function of the domain* D.

The above Corollary 1 gives more compactness for the magnetic potential $\vec{A}$ than has been obtained in Theorem 1. Note that $\nabla\times\left(\nabla\times\vec{A}\right)$ is a sum of singular measures supported on the layers, as can be seen from the Euler-Langrange equations (1.2). As a result, the magnetic potential has less regularity than the order parameters. A major challenge in the analysis of the Lawrence-Doniach model comes

from the discrete structure of the problem. In the limit as the interlayer distance s tends to zero, we need to show compactness for discrete quantities in the form of the discrete current and Jacobian defined in (1.7). Such compactness results are more difficult to establish for the magnetic potential $\vec{A}$ for the reason mentioned above. It is crucial to understand how the vector field $\vec{A}$ relates to its traces in this particular context. From the Euler-Lagrange equations (1.2), one can see that A^1 and A^2 satisfy elliptic equations with singular measure data supported on the layers. Bauman-Ko [8] made a connection between this problem and the single layer potential theory, and proved representation formulas for A^1 and A^2 using sum of single layer potentials defined on the layers. Based on their results, in [9], we proved an a priori estimate (see Theorem 3.1) which turns out to be very useful for the analysis of the Lawrence-Doniach model. In particular, this estimate gives compactness for discrete quantities involving the traces $\hat{A}_n$ as s goes to zero. A continuous analog of Theorem 3.1 is proved in Lemma 5.2.

1.3 Outline of the paper

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we provide some preliminaries that are needed in later sections. The proof of Theorem 1 constitutes the major part of this paper, and is included in Sections 3 through 6. We conclude Section 6 with the proof of Corollary 1. Finally, the last section is an appendix, which contains some approximation and extension results for the space V.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we provide some preliminary results that are needed for later sections. First we prove existence of minimizers of the limiting functional $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$ defined in (1.11). The proof is standard and follows from the direct method in the calculus of variations. However, since the functional $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$ contains a mixture of $2D$ and $3D$ functions, we believe that it is worth including a proof here.

Proposition 2.1. *The minimum of $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$ over $V \times E_0$ and over $V \times K_0$ is achieved. Moreover, we have*

$$\min_{V\times E_0} \mathcal{G}_{h_0} = \min_{V\times K_0} \mathcal{G}_{h_0}.$$

Proof. Given $(v, \vec{A}) \in V \times E_0$, using a similar argument as in Lemma 2.1 of [8], there exists a function $g \in H^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\vec{A} + \nabla g \in K_0$. By simple calculations, one can check that

$$\mathcal{G}_{h_0}(v + \hat{\nabla} g, \vec{A} + \nabla g) = \mathcal{G}_{h_0}(v, \vec{A}),$$

where recall that $\hat{\nabla}$ is the gradient operator with respect to x_1 and x_2. Therefore, it suffices to show that the minimum of $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$ is achieved by some $(v_0, \vec{A}_0) \in V \times K_0$.

Let $\{(v_k, \vec{A}_k)\} \subset V \times K_0$ be a minimizing sequence of $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$. By the definition of the space K_0 in (1.9), we have $\nabla \cdot \vec{A}_k = 0$. Recall that we have fixed $\vec{a}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(-x_2, x_1, 0)$. Therefore, we have $\nabla \cdot (\vec{A}_k - h_0\vec{a}) = 0$. By (1.6), we have

$$\|\vec{A}_k - h_0\vec{a}\|^2_{\check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left|\nabla \times \vec{A}_k - h_0\vec{e}_3\right|^2 dx.$$

Since $\{\mathcal{G}_{h_0}(v_k, \vec{A}_k)\}$ is a bounded sequence, it follows that $\{\vec{A}_k - h_0\vec{a}\}$ forms a bounded sequence in $\check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$, and, by (1.5), in $L^6(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$. Consequently, there exists $\vec{A}_0$ such that $\vec{A}_0 - h_0\vec{a} \in \check{H}^1 \cap L^6$ and, upon extraction,

$$\vec{A}_k - h_0\vec{a} \rightharpoonup \vec{A}_0 - h_0\vec{a} \quad \text{ in } \check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and in } L^6(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3). \tag{2.1}$$

(Here we do not distinguish between the original sequence and its convergent subsequences.) It is then clear that $\nabla \cdot (\vec{A}_0 - h_0\vec{a}) = 0$. Therefore we have $\vec{A}_0 \in K_0$. By compact Sobolev embedding, we have, upon another extraction,

$$\vec{A}_k \to \vec{A}_0 \quad \text{in } L^q(D;\mathbb{R}^3) \tag{2.2}$$

for $1 \le q < 6$, from which we deduce that $\{\hat{A}_k\}$ is bounded in $L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$. This along with the boundedness of $\{v_k - \hat{A}_k\}$ in $L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$ implies that $\{v_k\}$ is bounded in $L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$. So there exists $v_0 \in L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that, upon extraction,

$$v_k \rightharpoonup v_0 \quad \text{in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{2.3}$$

Now it only remains to show that $\mathrm{curl}v_0$ is a finite Radon measure. To this end, we take a test function $\varphi \in C_c^1(D)$. It follows from (2.3) and an integration by parts that

$$-\int_D v_0 \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx = -\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_D v_k \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_D \varphi d\mathrm{curl}v_k,$$

where $\hat{\nabla}^\perp$ denotes the operator $(-\partial_2, \partial_1)$. Since $\{\mathrm{curl}v_k\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{M}(D)$, we have

$$\int_D \varphi d\mathrm{curl}v_k \le C \sup|\varphi|$$

for some constant C independent of k and φ. Therefore we deduce that

$$\int_D \varphi d\mathrm{curl}v_0 = -\int_D v_0 \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx \le C \sup|\varphi|$$

for all $\varphi \in C_c^1(D)$, which implies $\mathrm{curl}v_0 \in \mathcal{M}(D)$. By (2.3), we have

$$\mathrm{curl}v_k \rightharpoonup \mathrm{curl}v_0 \quad \text{in } (C_c(D))^*. \tag{2.4}$$

Putting (2.1)-(2.4) together, and using lower semicontinuity, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{G}_{h_0}(v_0, \vec{A}_0) \le \liminf \mathcal{G}_{h_0}(v_k, \vec{A}_k) = \inf_{V\times K_0} \mathcal{G}_{h_0}.$$

Hence, $(v_0, \vec{A}_0) \in V \times K_0$ is a minimizer of $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$. □

Our next result concerns the density of $C^\infty(\overline{D};\mathbb{R}^2)$ in the space V (defined in (1.10)) with respect to a norm that is similar to that on the space of BV functions. More precisely, we have

Proposition 2.2. *Assume $v \in V$. There exists a sequence $\{v_k\} \subset V \cap C^\infty(\overline{D};\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that*

$$v_k \to v \quad \text{in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2), \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$|curlv_k|(D) \to |curlv|(D) \tag{2.6}$$

as $k \to \infty$.

The above proposition is needed in Section 4. Such results might be well-known to experts. However, the author did not find a proof in the literature. For the sake of completion, we include a proof in the last section as an appendix. Essentially, the space V carries a structure that is analogous to that on the space BV. We adapt standard approximation and extension techniques for BV functions to prove Proposition 2.2.

3 Compactness and lower bound

In this section, we prove the compactness and lower bound estimates in Theorem 1. By multiplying out the term $\hat{\nabla}_{\hat{A}_n} u_n = \hat{\nabla} u_n - \imath \hat{A}_n u_n$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A}) = s\sum_{n=0}^{N} E_\epsilon(u_n) - s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega (\hat{\nabla} u_n, \imath u_n)\cdot \hat{A}_n d\hat{x} + \frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega |u_n|^2 |\hat{A}_n|^2 d\hat{x} \\ + s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega \frac{1}{2\lambda^2 s^2}\left| u_{n+1} - u_n e^{\imath \int_{ns}^{(n+1)s} A^3 dx_3}\right|^2 d\hat{x} \\ + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left|\nabla\times\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{e}_3\right|^2 dx,\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where we denote

$$E_\epsilon(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \left[|\hat{\nabla} u|^2 + \frac{(1-|u|^2)^2}{2\epsilon^2}\right] d\hat{x}, \tag{3.2}$$

the simplified $2D$ Ginzburg-Landau energy without magnetic field. A similar decomposition as in (3.1) was used for the Ginzburg-Landau energy. (See [17] and [6].) The decomposition (3.1) allows us to separate the energy of the magnetic terms from the $2D$ Ginzburg-Landau energies on the layers.

3.1 An a priori estimate

For the estimates of the magnetic terms, a major obstacle is that the magnetic potential $\vec{A}$ appears both as a global $3D$ vector field and as $2D$ vector fields in the form of its traces $\hat{A}_n$ on the layers. In [9], we proved the following a priori estimate, which turns out to be crucial in the analysis of the Lawrence-Doniach energy in the limit as the interlayer distance s tends to zero.

Theorem 3.1 (Bauman-P. [9]). *Assume that $h_{ex} > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A}) \in [H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1}\times K$ is a minimizer of $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$. We have*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s}\int_\Omega \left[\left|\hat{A} - \hat{A}_n\right|^2 + \left|\hat{\nabla}(\hat{A} - \hat{A}_n)\right|^2\right] d\hat{x}dx_3 \le Cs^\alpha \mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A})$$

for all ϵ and s sufficiently small, where $0 < \alpha < 1$ and C are constants independent of ϵ and s.

Note that the corresponding theorem in [9] does not include the estimate for $\hat{A} - \hat{A}_n$. However, this can be obtained by slightly modifying the proof of the estimate in [9] for $\hat{\nabla}(\hat{A} - \hat{A}_n)$ without any difficulty.

3.2 The Jacobian estimate

For the $2D$ Ginzburg-Landau energies on the layers, a key step in the analysis is to separate the energy from the Jacobian (defined in (1.7)) by showing that its energy is concentrated in small regions with total measure tending to zero. Such Jacobian estimates were proved for the Ginzburg-Landau energy in [16] and [20] (see also [3]). The proof requires suitable upper bound on the $2D$ Ginzburg-Landau energy. In Lemma 3.2, using an upper bound on the Lawrence-Doniach energy (see (3.3)) and Theorem 3.1, we are able to show that the desired upper bound on the $2D$ Ginzburg-Landau energy holds on most of the layers. Then following a standard slicing argument that was used in [16] and [20], we are able to prove a Jacobian estimate for the Lawrence-Doniach energy in Lemma 3.4 (in particular, (3.15)).

By testing the energy $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$ with the configuration $u_n = 1$ for all $n = 0, 1, \cdots, N$ and $\vec{A} = h_{ex}\vec{a}$, and using the assumption $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{h_{ex}}{|\ln\epsilon|} = h_0 < \infty$, we easily see that

$$\min \mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s} \leq C(D)|\ln\epsilon|^2 \tag{3.3}$$

for ϵ sufficiently small, where $C(D)$ is a constant depending on the domain D. First we prove the following upper bound on the $2D$ Ginzburg-Landau energies on the layers.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume* $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{h_{ex}}{|\ln\epsilon|} = h_0 < \infty$. *Let* $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N, \vec{A}) \in [H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1} \times K$ *be minimizers of* $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$. *We have*

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N} E_\epsilon(u_n) \leq C|\ln\epsilon|^2$$

for all ϵ *and* s *sufficiently small, where* C *is a constant independent of* ϵ *and* s.

Proof. Using the decomposition (3.1) and the upper bound (3.3), we have

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N} E_\epsilon(u_n) \leq C|\ln\epsilon|^2 + s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega (\hat{\nabla}u_n, \imath u_n)\cdot \hat{A}_n d\hat{x}. \tag{3.4}$$

Therefore we only need to estimate the term $s\sum_{n=0}^N \int_\Omega (\hat{\nabla}u_n, \imath u_n)\cdot \hat{A}_n d\hat{x}$. We follow an idea used in [17] and [6]. First, by an elementary inequality and the fact that $|u_n| \leq 1$ a.e. (see [8]), we have

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega (\hat{\nabla}u_n, \imath u_n)\cdot \hat{A}_n d\hat{x} \leq s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{4}|\hat{\nabla}u_n|^2 + |\hat{A}_n|^2\right) d\hat{x}.$$

Plugging the above into (3.4) and using the expression of E_ϵ in (3.2), we obtain

$$\frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N} E_\epsilon(u_n) \leq C|\ln\epsilon|^2 + s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega |\hat{A}_n|^2 d\hat{x}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega |\hat{A}_n|^2 d\hat{x} \leq C|\ln\epsilon|^2 \tag{3.5}$$

for all ϵ and s sufficiently small.

By an elementary inequality, we have

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega |\hat{A}_n|^2 d\hat{x} \leq 2\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s}\int_\Omega \left(|\hat{A}-\hat{A}_n|^2 + |\hat{A}|^2\right) d\hat{x}dx_3. \tag{3.6}$$

It follows from Theorem 3.1 and (3.3) that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s}\int_\Omega |\hat{A}-\hat{A}_n|^2 d\hat{x}dx_3 \leq Cs^\alpha|\ln\epsilon|^2. \tag{3.7}$$

Using the assumption $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{h_{ex}}{|\ln\epsilon|} = h_0 < \infty$, we have

$$\int_D |\hat{A}|^2 dx \leq 2\int_D \left|\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a}\right|^2 dx + 2\int_D |h_{ex}\vec{a}|^2 dx \leq 2\int_D \left|\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a}\right|^2 dx + C|\ln\epsilon|^2.$$

It follows from Hölder's inequality and (1.5) that

$$\|\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a}\|^2_{L^2(D)} \leq C\|\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a}\|^2_{L^6(D)} \leq 4C\|\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a}\|^2_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

Using (1.6) and (3.3), it is clear that

$$\|\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a}\|^2_{\dot{H}^1} \leq C|\ln\epsilon|^2.$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\int_D |\hat{A}|^2 dx \leq C|\ln\epsilon|^2. \tag{3.8}$$

Hence, (3.5) follows from (3.6)-(3.8). □

The above Lemma 3.2 enables us to prove a Jacobian estimate for the Lawrence-Doniach energy. The proof is very similar to that for the higher dimensional Ginzburg-Landau energy in [16] and [20]. Here we provide the proof for the convenience of the reader. We first recall a covering result from [20] which is convenient for our purposes. As in [20], we choose a sequence $M(\epsilon)$ such that, for all $\alpha > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \epsilon^\alpha M(\epsilon) = 0, \quad \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{|\ln\epsilon|}{M(\epsilon)^\alpha} = 0, \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$\ln M(\epsilon) = o(|\ln\epsilon|) \text{ as } \epsilon \to 0.$$

Then we have the following proposition which is Proposition 4.2 in [20]:

Proposition 3.3 (Sandier-Serfaty [20]). *If u satisfies $E_\epsilon(u) < c_0 M(\epsilon)$ for some constant c_0 and some $0 < \epsilon < 1$, then there exist disjoint balls $B^1, \cdots, B^l$ with $B^i = B(a^i, r^i)$ such that, denoting $\tilde{\Omega} = \{x \in \Omega : dist(x, \partial\Omega) > \epsilon\}$, we have*

1. $$\sum_i r^i \leq \frac{1}{M(\epsilon)}. \tag{3.10}$$

2. *For any $x \in \tilde{\Omega} \setminus \cup_i B^i$, $||u(x)| - 1| \leq \frac{2}{M(\epsilon)}$.*

3. *If $B^i \subset \tilde{\Omega}$,*
$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{B^i} |\hat{\nabla} u|^2 \geq \pi|d^i||\ln\epsilon|(1 - o_\epsilon(1)), \tag{3.11}$$
where $d^i = \deg(u, \partial B^i)$, and $o_\epsilon(1) \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

4. *Letting $\mu^\epsilon = \pi \sum_{\{i:a^i\in\tilde{\Omega}\}} d^i \delta_{a^i}$, we have*
$$\| Ju - \mu^\epsilon \|_{(C_c^{0,1})^*} \leq C\frac{E_\epsilon(u)}{M(\epsilon)} \tag{3.12}$$
for some constant C depending only on c_0.

Using the above proposition, we are able to prove the following lemma, whose proof follows closely that of Proposition 4.3 in [20].

Lemma 3.4. *Assume* $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{h_{\epsilon x}}{|\ln\epsilon|}=h_0<\infty$. *Let* $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N,\vec{A})\in[H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1}\times K$ *be minimizers of* $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$. *Then, up to a subsequence as* $(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)$, *we have*

$$\frac{j^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln\epsilon|}\rightharpoonup v_0 \text{ in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2), \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\frac{J^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln\epsilon|}\rightharpoonup w_0 \text{ in } (C_c^{0,\alpha}(D))^* \text{ for all } 0<\alpha\le 1, \tag{3.14}$$

for some $v_0\in L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$ *such that* $w_0=\frac{1}{2}curlv_0$ *is a Radon measure. Moreover, there exist sets* $Z_n^\epsilon\subset\Omega$ *with* $\lim s\sum_{n=0}^N|Z_n^\epsilon|=0$ *such that*

$$\liminf_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)}\frac{s}{2|\ln\epsilon|^2}\sum_{n=0}^N\int_{Z_n^\epsilon}|\hat{\nabla}u_n|^2d\hat{x}\ge|w_0|(D). \tag{3.15}$$

Proof. Since $(\{u_n\}_{n=0}^N,\vec{A})\in[H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1}\times K$ is a minimizer of $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}$, we have $|u_n|\le 1$ for all $n=0,1,\cdots,N$. It follows that

$$|j(u_n)|=|(\imath u_n,\hat{\nabla}u_n)|\le|\hat{\nabla}u_n| \tag{3.16}$$

for all $n=0,1,\cdots,N$. We deduce from Lemma 3.2 that $\left\{\frac{j^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln\epsilon|}\right\}$ forms a bounded sequence in $L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$, from which we immediately obtain (3.13).

By simple calculations, we have

$$|Ju_n|=|\partial_1u_n\times\partial_2u_n|\le|\hat{\nabla}u_n|^2. \tag{3.17}$$

To show (3.14), we use an interpolation argument first used in [16]. First we show compactness of the sequence $\left\{\frac{J^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln\epsilon|}\right\}$ in $(C_c^{0,1}(D))^*$ by a slicing argument. We define $\mu^{\epsilon,s}=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\mu_n^\epsilon\chi_n(x_3)$ with

$$\mu_n^\epsilon=\begin{cases}\pi\sum_{\{i:a_n^i\in\tilde{\Omega}_n\}}d_n^i\delta_{a_n^i} & \text{if } E_\epsilon(u_n)<c_0M(\epsilon),\\ 0 & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

where a_n^i and d_n^i are as in Proposition 3.3, and the functions χ_n are defined in (1.8). Let $\nu_n^\epsilon=Ju_n-\mu_n^\epsilon$ and $\nu^{\epsilon,s}=J^{\epsilon,s}-\mu^{\epsilon,s}$. Let $\varphi\in C_c^{0,1}(D)$ be a test function. We have

$$\int_D\varphi d\nu^{\epsilon,s}=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s}\int_\Omega\varphi(\hat{x},x_3)d\nu_n^\epsilon dx_3. \tag{3.18}$$

If $E_\epsilon(u_n)<c_0M(\epsilon)$, then we obtain from (3.12) that

$$\int_\Omega\varphi(\hat{x},x_3)d\nu_n^\epsilon\le C\parallel\varphi\parallel_{C^{0,1}(D)}\frac{E_\epsilon(u_n)}{M(\epsilon)} \tag{3.19}$$

for all $x_3\in(ns,(n+1)s)$. If $E_\epsilon(u_n)\ge c_0M(\epsilon)$, then, by definition, we have $\mu_n^\epsilon=0$, and therefore, $\nu_n^\epsilon=Ju_n$. Using an integration by parts, we have

$$\int_\Omega\varphi d\nu_n^\epsilon=\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega\varphi\ \mathrm{curl}j(u_n)d\hat{x}=-\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega\hat{\nabla}^\perp\varphi\cdot j(u_n)d\hat{x},$$

where recall that $\hat{\nabla}^\perp=(-\partial_2,\partial_1)$. Therefore, we obtain from (3.16) and Hölder's inequality that

$$\left|\int_\Omega\varphi d\nu_n^\epsilon\right|\le\frac{\parallel\varphi\parallel_{C^{0,1}(D)}}{2}\int_\Omega|\hat{\nabla}u_n|d\hat{x}\le C(\Omega)\parallel\varphi\parallel_{C^{0,1}(D)}E_\epsilon(u_n)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It follows from the assumption $E_\epsilon(u_n) \geq c_0 M(\epsilon)$ that $E_\epsilon(u_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{E_\epsilon(u_n)}{M(\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$. Therefore, we deduce that

$$\left| \int_\Omega \varphi d\nu_n^\epsilon \right| \leq C(\Omega, c_0) \parallel \varphi \parallel_{C^{0,1}(D)} \frac{E_\epsilon(u_n)}{M(\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \tag{3.20}$$

provided $E_\epsilon(u_n) \geq c_0 M(\epsilon)$. It follows from (3.18)-(3.20), and the choice of $M(\epsilon)$ that

$$\left| \int_D \varphi d\nu^{\epsilon,s} \right| \leq C \parallel \varphi \parallel_{C^{0,1}(D)} s \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{E_\epsilon(u_n)}{M(\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

for some constant C depending only on Ω and c_0. The above together with Lemma 3.2 imply that

$$\parallel \nu^{\epsilon,s} \parallel_{(C_c^{0,1}(D))^*} \leq Cs \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{E_\epsilon(u_n)}{M(\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \frac{C|\ln \epsilon|^2}{M(\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tag{3.21}$$

for some constant C as above. Using Lemma 3.2, (3.11) and (3.17), we have

$$\parallel \nu^{\epsilon,s} \parallel_{(C_c^0(D))^*} \leq \|J^{\epsilon,s}\|_{(C_c^0(D))^*} + \|\mu^{\epsilon,s}\|_{(C_c^0(D))^*} \leq C|\ln \epsilon|^2. \tag{3.22}$$

By Lemma 3.3 in [16], for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, we have

$$\parallel \nu^{\epsilon,s} \parallel_{(C_c^{0,\alpha}(D))^*} \leq C \parallel \nu^{\epsilon,s} \parallel^{1-\alpha}_{(C_c^0(D))^*} \parallel \nu^{\epsilon,s} \parallel^{\alpha}_{(C_c^{0,1}(D))^*}. \tag{3.23}$$

Therefore, we deduce from (3.9) and (3.21)-(3.23) that

$$\left\| \frac{\nu^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln \epsilon|} \right\|_{(C_c^{0,\alpha}(D))^*} \to 0 \tag{3.24}$$

as $(\epsilon, s) \to (0,0)$. The boundedness of $\{\frac{\mu^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln \epsilon|}\}$ in $(C_c^0(D))^*$ and the compact embedding $(C_c^0(D))^* \subset\subset (C_c^{0,\alpha}(D))^*$ (see Lemma 3.4 in [16]) imply the precompactness of $\{\frac{\mu^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln \epsilon|}\}$ in $(C_c^{0,\alpha}(D))^*$. Therefore, the precompactness of $\{\frac{J^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln \epsilon|}\}$ in $(C_c^{0,\alpha}(D))^*$ follows from (3.24).

Finally, to show (3.15), we let $Z_n^\epsilon = \cup_i B_n^i$, where B_n^i are the balls as in Proposition 3.3. (If $E_\epsilon(u_n) \geq c_0 M(\epsilon)$, we simply set $Z_n^\epsilon = \emptyset$.) By (3.10), we have $|Z_n^\epsilon| \leq \frac{C}{M(\epsilon)^2}$, from which we immediately have

$$\lim_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} s \sum_n |Z_n^\epsilon| = 0.$$

Let $\varphi \in C_c^1(D)$ be a test function. It follows from (3.14) and (3.24) that

$$\int_D \varphi dw_0 = \lim_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} \int_D \varphi d\frac{J^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln \epsilon|} = \lim_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} \int_D \varphi d\frac{\mu^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln \epsilon|}. \tag{3.25}$$

By (3.11), we have

$$\int_D \varphi d\frac{\mu^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln \epsilon|} \leq \sup|\varphi| \cdot s \sum_n \sum_i \frac{\pi |d_n^i|}{|\ln \epsilon|} \leq \sup|\varphi| \cdot \frac{s}{2|\ln \epsilon|^2} \sum_n \int_{Z_n^\epsilon} |\hat{\nabla} u_n|^2 d\hat{x} + o_\epsilon(1) \sup|\varphi|. \tag{3.26}$$

By putting (3.26) and (3.25) together, and taking the supremum over all φ such that $\sup|\varphi| \leq 1$, we immediately obtain (3.15). □

3.3 Proof of lower bound in Theorem 1

Now we prove the lower bound estimate in Theorem 1. The proof follows a standard idea used for the Ginzburg-Landau energy. Here the treatment of the magnetic potential $\vec{A}$ is slightly different due to the layered structure of the problem.

Proof of (1.15). First, by a short argument using (3.13) and (3.15), it is easy to show

$$\liminf_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} \frac{s\sum_{n=0}^{N} E_\epsilon(u_n)}{|\ln\epsilon|^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \parallel v_0 \parallel^2_{L^2(D)} + |w_0|(D). \tag{3.27}$$

(See the proof of (1.7) in [6].)

Let us focus on the terms involving the magnetic potential $\vec{A}$ in the decomposition (3.1). By (3.3), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left|\nabla \times (\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a})\right|^2 dx \leq C|\ln\epsilon|^2.$$

Using arguments similar to those in Proposition 2.1, we have that, up to a subsequence,

$$\frac{\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a}}{|\ln\epsilon|} \rightharpoonup \vec{A}_0 - h_0\vec{a} \quad \text{in } \check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3) \tag{3.28}$$

for some $\vec{A}_0 \in h_0\vec{a} + \check{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^3)$, and that

$$\liminf_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} \frac{1}{2|\ln\epsilon|^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left|\nabla \times (\vec{A} - h_{ex}\vec{a})\right|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left|\nabla \times (\vec{A}_0 - h_0\vec{a})\right|^2 dx. \tag{3.29}$$

Let us denote $\hat{A}^{\epsilon,s} = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \hat{A}_n\chi_n$ with χ_n defined in (1.8). Using Theorem 3.1 and (3.3), we have

$$\frac{\|\hat{A}^{\epsilon,s} - \hat{A}\|^2_{L^2(D)}}{|\ln\epsilon|^2} \leq Cs^\alpha \to 0.$$

It follows from (3.28) and the compact Sobolev embedding theorem that, up to a subsequence,

$$\frac{\hat{A}}{|\ln\epsilon|} \to \hat{A}_0 \quad \text{in } L^2(D).$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\frac{\hat{A}^{\epsilon,s}}{|\ln\epsilon|} \to \hat{A}_0 \quad \text{in } L^2(D) \tag{3.30}$$

as $(\epsilon, s) \to (0, 0)$. This together with (3.13) yield

$$\lim_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} \frac{s}{|\ln\epsilon|^2}\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega (\hat{\nabla}u_n, \imath u_n)\cdot\hat{A}_n d\hat{x} = \int_D v_0\cdot\hat{A}_0 dx. \tag{3.31}$$

Next, we write

$$\frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega |u_n|^2|\hat{A}_n|^2 d\hat{x} = \frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega (|u_n|^2-1)|\hat{A}_n|^2 d\hat{x} + \frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega |\hat{A}_n|^2 d\hat{x}. \tag{3.32}$$

For the first term, we can write

$$\frac{s}{2}\sum_n\int_\Omega (|u_n|^2-1)|\hat{A}_n|^2 d\hat{x} = \frac{1}{2}\int_D \left(\sum_n (|u_n|^2-1)\chi_n\right)\left(\sum_n |\hat{A}_n|^2\chi_n\right) dx.$$

Using an elementary inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\int_D \left(\sum_n \left||u_n|^2-1\right|\chi_n\right)\left(\sum_n |\hat{A}_n|^2\chi_n\right)dx \\ \leq \int_D \left(\sum_n \left||u_n|^2-1\right|\chi_n\right)\left|\sum_n \hat{A}_n\chi_n-\hat{A}\right|^2 dx+\int_D \left(\sum_n \left||u_n|^2-1\right|\chi_n\right)|\hat{A}|^2dx.\end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Using Theorem 3.1, (3.3) and the fact that $|u_n|\leq 1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|^2}\int_D \left(\sum_n \left||u_n|^2-1\right|\chi_n\right)\left|\sum_n \hat{A}_n\chi_n-\hat{A}\right|^2 dx \leq \frac{C}{|\ln\epsilon|^2}\int_D \left|\sum_n \hat{A}_n\chi_n-\hat{A}\right|^2 dx\to 0. \tag{3.34}$$

Using Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_D \left(\sum_n \left||u_n|^2-1\right|\chi_n\right)|\hat{A}|^2dx &\leq \left(\int_D \left(\sum_n \left||u_n|^2-1\right|\chi_n\right)^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\hat{A}\|^2_{L^4(D)} \\ &= \epsilon\left(s\sum_n\int_\Omega \frac{(1-|u_n|^2)^2}{\epsilon^2}d\hat{x}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\hat{A}\|^2_{L^4(D)} \\ &\leq \epsilon\left(4s\sum_n E_\epsilon(u_n)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\hat{A}\|^2_{L^4(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Sobolev embedding theorem and (3.28) that $\|\hat{A}\|^2_{L^4(D)}$ is bounded. Therefore, we deduce from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\int_D \left(\sum_n \left||u_n|^2-1\right|\chi_n\right)|\hat{A}|^2dx \leq C\epsilon|\ln\epsilon|\to 0. \tag{3.35}$$

By putting (3.33)-(3.35) together, we obtain

$$\frac{s}{2|\ln\epsilon|^2}\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega \left(|u_n|^2-1\right)|\hat{A}_n|^2d\hat{x}\to 0.$$

It follows from the above, (3.30) and (3.32) that

$$\lim_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)}\frac{s}{2|\ln\epsilon|^2}\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega |u_n|^2|\hat{A}_n|^2d\hat{x}=\frac{1}{2}\int_D|\hat{A}_0|^2dx. \tag{3.36}$$

Finally, using the fact $|u_n|\leq 1$, and the assumption (1.14), it is clear that

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega \frac{1}{2\lambda^2s^2}\left|u_{n+1}-u_ne^{\iota\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s}A^3dx_3}\right|^2 d\hat{x}\to 0. \tag{3.37}$$

Putting (3.27), (3.29), (3.31), (3.36) and (3.37) into (3.1), we obtain (1.15). □

4 Construction of the order parameters

In this and the next sections, we construct the recovery sequence satisfying the upper bound inequality in Theorem 1. This section is devoted to the construction of the order parameters $\{u_n\}$ on the layers. Essentially, on each layer, we follow constructions of test configurations for the $2D$ Ginzburg-Landau energy used in [19] and [17]. Here additional work is needed to take into account the limiting process as the interlayer distance s tends to zero. This introduces several aspects of technical issues. First, this changes the locations of the layers and the vortices on the layers. Secondly, our results in this section do not rely on the assumption (1.14). In other words, the estimates are independent of the relative size of ϵ and s. Lastly, we need to show compactness for discrete quantities that are in the form of sums of functions defined on the layers. As a result, some technical modifications of the $2D$ constructions as well as compactness results are needed in the proof.

Given $v \in V \cap C^\infty(\overline{D};\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $s = \frac{L}{N}$, for all $n = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1$, we define $v_n(\hat{x}) = v(\hat{x}, ns)$ and $w_n(\hat{x}) = w(\hat{x}, ns)$, where $w(x) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{curl} v(x)$. Let

$$v^s(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} v_n(\hat{x})\chi_n(x_3), \qquad w^s(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} w_n(\hat{x})\chi_n(x_3).$$

It is clear that

$$v^s \to v \quad \text{and} \quad w^s \to w \quad \text{uniformly as } s \to 0. \tag{4.1}$$

The main result of this section is the following

Theorem 4.1. *Given $v \in V \cap C^\infty(\overline{D};\mathbb{R}^2)$, there exists a sequence $\{u_n^\epsilon\}_{n=0}^N \subset [H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1}$ such that*

$$v^{\epsilon,s} := \frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u_n^\epsilon)\chi_n \to v \quad \text{in } L^p(D;\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ for all } p < \frac{3}{2}, \tag{4.2}$$

$$w^{\epsilon,s} := \frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} J(u_n^\epsilon)\chi_n \rightharpoonup w \quad \text{in } W^{-1,p}(D) \text{ for all } p < \frac{3}{2}, \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\limsup_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} s\sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{E_\epsilon(u_n^\epsilon)}{|\ln\epsilon|^2} \le \frac{\|v\|_{L^2(D)}^2}{2} + \|w\|_{L^1(D)}. \tag{4.4}$$

The above theorem generalizes Proposition 7.1 in [17], in which a recovery sequence for the $2D$ Ginzburg-Landau energy is constructed. Here we construct functions u_n^ϵ on the layers $\Omega_n = \Omega \times \{ns\}$ based on the two-dimensional constructions given in [19] and [17]. We follow the approach given in [17], which is more convenient in the three-dimensional context. As mentioned above, some technical modifications of the $2D$ constructions are needed to obtain uniform estimates on the layers. Also, some compactness results need to be proved. (In particular, see Lemma 4.2.)

Since Ω is a simply connected smooth domain, it is well-known that one can decompose $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)$ as a direct sum

$$L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathscr{F} \oplus \mathscr{G},$$

where

$$\mathscr{F} := \{v : v = \hat{\nabla} \times f, f \in H^1(\Omega), f = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\},$$

and

$$\mathscr{G} := \{v : v = \hat{\nabla} g, g \in H^1(\Omega)\}.$$

(See, e.g., [14].) For each v_n, we write

$$v_n = v_{n,1} + v_{n,2}, \tag{4.5}$$

where $v_{n,1} \in \mathscr{F}$ and $v_{n,2} \in \mathscr{G}$. Then we have

$$v_{n,1} = (\partial_2 f, -\partial_1 f)$$

for some $f \in H^1(\Omega)$ with $f = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. By simple calculations, we have

$$-\hat{\Delta} f = \mathrm{curl} v_{n,1} = \mathrm{curl} v_n = 2w_n,$$

where $\hat{\Delta}$ denotes the $2D$ Laplacian. Therefore, we write $f = -2\hat{\Delta}_D^{-1} w_n$, and $v_{n,1} = -2\hat{\nabla} \times \hat{\Delta}_D^{-1} w_n$, where $\hat{\Delta}_D^{-1}$ is the inverse operator of the $2D$ Laplacian with zero Dirichlet boundary data. Define

$$v_1^s(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} v_{n,1}(\hat{x})\chi_n(x_3) \quad \text{and} \quad v_2^s(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} v_{n,2}(\hat{x})\chi_n(x_3).$$

First, we prove compactness of the sequences $\{v_1^s\}$ and $\{v_2^s\}$ in $L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let v_1^s and v_2^s be as above. There exist $v_1, v_2 \in L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that*

$$v_1 + v_2 = v,$$

$$v_1^s \to v_1 \quad \textit{and} \quad v_2^s \to v_2 \quad \textit{in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2) \textit{ as } s \to 0,$$

and

$$\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = \langle v_1^s, v_2 \rangle = \langle v_1, v_2^s \rangle = 0$$

for all s, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product in $L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Proof. Let $\{s_k\}$ be a sequence such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} s_k = 0$. We denote $v^k = v^{s_k}$ and $v_i^k = v_i^{s_k}$ for $i = 1, 2$. It follows from (4.1) that

$$v_1^k + v_2^k = v^k \to v \quad \text{in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ as } k \to \infty. \tag{4.6}$$

Since $\|v^k\|_2^2 = \|v_1^k\|_2^2 + \|v_2^k\|_2^2$, we deduce from (4.6) that $\{v_1^k\}$ and $\{v_2^k\}$ form bounded sequences in L^2. Therefore, there exist $v_1, v_2 \in L^2$ such that

$$v_1^{k_j} \rightharpoonup v_1 \quad \text{and} \quad v_2^{k_j} \rightharpoonup v_2$$

for some subsequence $\{v_i^{k_j}\}$. It is clear that $v_1 + v_2 = v$. From the weak convergence, we have

$$\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = \lim_{j\to\infty} \lim_{l\to\infty} \langle v_1^{k_j}, v_2^{k_l} \rangle = 0, \tag{4.7}$$

since $v_1^{k_j}$ and $v_2^{k_l}$ are mutually orthogonal for all k_j and k_l. Similarly, we have

$$\langle v_1^{k_j}, v_2 \rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle v_1, v_2^{k_l} \rangle = 0. \tag{4.8}$$

It follows from (4.6)-(4.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \lim_{j\to\infty} \langle v^{k_j} - v, v^{k_j} - v \rangle &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \langle (v_1^{k_j} - v_1) + (v_2^{k_j} - v_2), (v_1^{k_j} - v_1) + (v_2^{k_j} - v_2) \rangle \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \left(\|v_1^{k_j} - v_1\|_2^2 + \|v_2^{k_j} - v_2\|_2^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

from which we immediately deduce

$$v_1^{k_j} \to v_1 \quad \text{and} \quad v_2^{k_j} \to v_2.$$

Suppose that another subsequence $\{v_i^{m_j}\}$ of $\{v_i^k\}$, for $i = 1, 2$, satisfies

$$v_1^{m_j} \to \tilde{v}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad v_2^{m_j} \to \tilde{v}_2$$

for some $\tilde{v}_1$ and $\tilde{v}_2$. Clearly we have $\tilde{v}_1 + \tilde{v}_2 = v$. Using a similar argument as in (4.7), we have

$$\langle \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2 \rangle = \langle \tilde{v}_1, v_2 \rangle = \langle v_1, \tilde{v}_2 \rangle = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle (v_1 + v_2) - (\tilde{v}_1 + \tilde{v}_2), (v_1 + v_2) - (\tilde{v}_1 + \tilde{v}_2) \rangle \\ &= \langle (v_1 - \tilde{v}_1) + (v_2 - \tilde{v}_2), (v_1 - \tilde{v}_1) + (v_2 - \tilde{v}_2) \rangle \\ &= \|v_1 - \tilde{v}_1\|_2^2 + \|v_2 - \tilde{v}_2\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

from which we have $v_1 = \tilde{v}_1$ and $v_2 = \tilde{v}_2$. By a contradiction argument, this implies that the subsequence $\{v_i^{k_j}\}$ contains all but at most finitely many terms in $\{v_i^k\}$. Therefore, we have strong L^2 compactness for the whole sequence $\{v_i^k\}$ for $i = 1, 2$. □

In the following, we construct recovery sequences for v_1 and v_2 respectively, as has been done in [17].

4.1 Recovery sequence for v_1

Lemma 4.3. *Let v_1 be as in Lemma 4.2. There exists a sequence $\{u_n^\epsilon\}_{n=0}^N \subset [H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C})]^{N+1}$ such that the conclusions of Theorem 4.1 hold with v replaced by v_1.*

To prove the above Lemma 4.3, we will need a couple of auxiliary lemmas. We define $\xi(\hat{x}) = \frac{(x_2, -x_1)}{|\hat{x}|^2}$. Let $\eta : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a standard mollifier supported in the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta = 1$, and define $\eta^\epsilon := \eta(\frac{x}{\epsilon})/\epsilon^2$. We define $q^\epsilon : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ by requiring

$$q^\epsilon(\hat{x})\xi(\hat{x}) = \eta^\epsilon * \xi(\hat{x}). \tag{4.9}$$

We have the following lemma taken from [17], Lemma 7.3, which summarizes some useful properties of the function q^ϵ.

Lemma 4.4 (Jerrard-Soner [17])**.** *The function q^ϵ is well-defined, smooth and radial, and has the following properties:*

$$0 \le q^\epsilon \le 1, \quad q^\epsilon(\hat{x}) = 1 \text{ whenever } |\hat{x}| \ge \epsilon, \tag{4.10}$$

$$q^\epsilon(\hat{x}) = q^1(\frac{\hat{x}}{\epsilon}), \tag{4.11}$$

and

$$\|q^\epsilon \xi\|_\infty \le \frac{C}{\epsilon}, \quad \int_{B_\epsilon} |q^\epsilon(\hat{x})\xi(\hat{x})|^2 d\hat{x} \le C \text{ for some } C \text{ independent of } \epsilon.$$

In the next lemma, we select vortices for each function u_n^ϵ.

Lemma 4.5. *Assume $w \in C^\infty(\overline{D})$. For all $n = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1$, there exist families of points $\{a^\epsilon_{n,i}\}_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_n}$ and integers $\sigma^\epsilon_{n,i} = \pm 1$ such that*

$$w^{\epsilon,s} := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} w^\epsilon_n \chi_n \rightharpoonup w \text{ weakly in } \mathcal{M}(D) \text{ and strongly in } W^{-1,p}(D) \text{ for all } p < \frac{3}{2} \tag{4.12}$$

as $(\epsilon, s) \to (0,0)$, where

$$w^\epsilon_n = \frac{\pi}{|\ln \epsilon|} \sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_n} \sigma^\epsilon_{n,i} \delta_{a^\epsilon_{n,i}}.$$

Moreover, the points $\{a^\epsilon_{n,i}\}$ can be chosen such that

$$|a^\epsilon_{n,i} - a^\epsilon_{n,j}| \geq c_0 |\ln \epsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \forall i \neq j, \quad dist(a^\epsilon_{n,i}, \partial\Omega) \geq c_0 |\ln \epsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \forall i, \tag{4.13}$$

where c_0 is some small constant depending on $\|w\|_\infty$. Finally, we also have the estimate

$$s \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|w^\epsilon_n - w_n\|^p_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \to 0 \tag{4.14}$$

as $(\epsilon, s) \to (0,0)$.

Proof. The proof relies on selecting points on each layer $\Omega_n = \Omega \times \{ns\}$. Let

$$\delta_\epsilon = |\ln \epsilon|^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

For each ϵ, we define the family of squares in $\mathbb{R}^2$

$$\{Q^\epsilon_i\}_i = \{[k\delta_\epsilon, (k+1)\delta_\epsilon] \times [l\delta_\epsilon, (l+1)\delta_\epsilon] : k, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Denote

$$I_\epsilon := \{i : Q^\epsilon_i \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We write $\Omega_n = \cup_i \Omega^\epsilon_{n,i}$, where $\Omega^\epsilon_{n,i} = \Omega_n \cap Q^\epsilon_i$ for $i \in I_\epsilon$. In each $\Omega^\epsilon_{n,i}$, we define

$$M^\epsilon_{n,i} = \begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{|\ln \epsilon|}{\pi} | \int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,i}} w_n d\hat{x} | \rfloor & \text{if} \quad \text{dist}(\Omega^\epsilon_{n,i}, \partial\Omega_n) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{4.15}$$

where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the integer part of a real number x, and

$$\sigma^\epsilon_{n,i} = \text{sgn}(\int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,i}} w_n d\hat{x}).$$

Note that $M^\epsilon_{n,i} \leq C\|w\|_\infty |\ln \epsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for some pure constant C. Therefore, in each $\Omega^\epsilon_{n,i}$, it is possible to place $M^\epsilon_{n,i}$ points $\{a^\epsilon_{n,ij}\}$ evenly such that (4.13) is satisfied. Now we define

$$w^\epsilon_n = \frac{\pi}{|\ln \epsilon|} \sum_i \sum_j \sigma^\epsilon_{n,i} \delta_{a^\epsilon_{n,ij}}.$$

Upon relabeling of $\{a^\epsilon_{n,ij}\}$, the above defined w^ϵ_n has the desired form.

Next we verify (4.12). Note that, by the definition of $M^\epsilon_{n,i}$ in (4.15), we have

$$M^\epsilon_n := \sum_i M^\epsilon_{n,i} \le \frac{|\ln\epsilon|}{\pi}\|w_n\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

It follows from (4.1) that

$$|w^{\epsilon,s}|(D) \le s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|}M^\epsilon_n \le s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\|w_n\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \to \|w\|_{L^1(D)}. \tag{4.16}$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove strong convergence of $w^{\epsilon,s}$ in $W^{-1,p}$ for all $p<\frac{3}{2}$. Fix some $p<\frac{3}{2}$ and take a test function $\phi\in W^{1,p'}_0(D)$ with $\|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(D)}\le 1$, where $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{p'}=1$. It is clear that $p'>3$. By the Sobolev embedding theorem, we have $\phi\in C^{0,\alpha}(D)$ for some $\alpha>0$ and $\|\phi\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(D)}\le C$ for some constant C depending on p'. (See, e.g., [12].) It suffices to verify

$$\sup_{\|\phi\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(D)}\le 1}\left|\int_D \phi dw^{\epsilon,s} - \int_D \phi w^s dx\right| \to 0 \tag{4.17}$$

as $(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)$. By the definitions of $w^{\epsilon,s}$ and w^s, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_D \phi dw^{\epsilon,s} - \int_D \phi w^s dx\right| &= \left|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s}\left[\frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_n}\sigma^\epsilon_{n,i}\phi(a^\epsilon_{n,i}) - \int_\Omega \phi w_n d\hat{x}\right]dx_3\right| \\ &\le \sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s}\sum_j\left|\frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\sigma^\epsilon_{n,i}\phi(a^\epsilon_{n,i}) - \int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}}\phi w_n d\hat{x}\right|dx_3,\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

where we use the convention that $\frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\sigma^\epsilon_{n,i}\phi(a^\epsilon_{n,i})=0$ if $M^\epsilon_{n,j}=0$. If $\mathrm{dist}(\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j},\partial\Omega_n)>0$ and $\mathrm{sgn}(\int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}} w_n d\hat{x})=1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\sigma^\epsilon_{n,i}\phi(a^\epsilon_{n,i}) - \int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}}\phi w_n d\hat{x}\right| \\ &\le \sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}|\phi(a^\epsilon_{n,i})|\left|\frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|} - \frac{1}{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}} w_n d\hat{x}\right| + \frac{1}{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}}\big|\phi(a^\epsilon_{n,i})-\phi\big||w_n|d\hat{x}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\phi\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(D)}\le 1$, using the definition of $M^\epsilon_{n,j}$ in (4.15), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}|\phi(a^\epsilon_{n,i})|\left|\frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|} - \frac{1}{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}} w_n d\hat{x}\right| \le M^\epsilon_{n,j}\left|\frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|} - \frac{1}{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}} w_n d\hat{x}\right| \le \frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}}\big|\phi(a^\epsilon_{n,i})-\phi\big||w_n|d\hat{x} \le \|w\|_\infty|\ln\epsilon|^{-\frac{\alpha}{4}-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\left|\frac{\pi}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_{n,j}}\sigma^\epsilon_{n,i}\phi(a^\epsilon_{n,i}) - \int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}}\phi w_n d\hat{x}\right| \le C|\ln\epsilon|^{-\frac{\alpha}{4}-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{4.19}$$

for some constant C depending on $\|w\|_\infty$. The cases when $\mathrm{dist}(\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}, \partial\Omega_n) > 0$ and $\mathrm{sgn}(\int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}} w_n d\hat{x}) = -1$ or 0 are similar. If $\mathrm{dist}(\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}, \partial\Omega_n) = 0$, then we have $w^\epsilon_n = 0$ on $\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}$, from which we deduce

$$\left| \int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}} \phi dw^\epsilon_n - \int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}} \phi w_n d\hat{x} \right| = \left| \int_{\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}} \phi w_n d\hat{x} \right| \le \|w\|_\infty |\ln \epsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.20}$$

Since $\mathrm{Card}\{j : \mathrm{dist}(\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}, \partial\Omega_n) > 0\} \le C|\ln\epsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mathrm{Card}\{j : \mathrm{dist}(\Omega^\epsilon_{n,j}, \partial\Omega_n) = 0\} \le C|\ln\epsilon|^{\frac{1}{4}}$ for some constant C depending on Ω, we deduce from (4.19)-(4.20) that

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} \phi dw^\epsilon_n - \int_{\Omega} \phi w_n d\hat{x} \right| \le C|\ln\epsilon|^{-\frac{\alpha}{4}} \tag{4.21}$$

for some constant C depending on Ω and $\|w\|_\infty$. By plugging (4.21) into (4.18), and noting that $sN = L$ is fixed, we immediately obtain (4.17), from which (4.12) follows.

Finally, to verify (4.14), note that, from (4.21), one has

$$\|w^\epsilon_n - w_n\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \le C|\ln\epsilon|^{-\frac{\alpha}{4}}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|w^\epsilon_n - w_n\|^p_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \le sNC|\ln\epsilon|^{-\frac{p\alpha}{4}} = \tilde{C}|\ln\epsilon|^{-\frac{p\alpha}{4}} \to 0$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$, where $\tilde{C} = sNC$ depends only on D and $\|w\|_\infty$. □

Now we provide the proof of Lemma 4.3. We follow the ideas in the proof of Lemma 7.2 in [17], with some technical modifications to take care of the limiting process as $s \to 0$.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Fix a pair (ϵ, s). For each $n = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1$, we have w^ϵ_n from Lemma 4.5. Define $v^\epsilon_n = -2\hat{\nabla} \times \hat{\Delta}_D^{-1} w^\epsilon_n$. Next we define ϕ^ϵ_n to be a multivalued function satisfying $\hat{\nabla}\phi^\epsilon_n = |\ln\epsilon| v^\epsilon_n$. It is easy to see that ϕ^ϵ_n is well-defined modulo 2π. Finally define

$$u^\epsilon_n := \rho^\epsilon_n e^{i\phi^\epsilon_n}, \qquad \rho^\epsilon_n := \prod q^\epsilon(\hat{x} - a^\epsilon_{n,i}),$$

where q^ϵ is defined in (4.9) with properties summarized in Lemma 4.4. In addition, we can set $u^\epsilon_N \equiv 1$. We show that the above defined functions $\{u^\epsilon_n\}$ satisfy the properties (4.2)-(4.4) with v replaced by v_1.

Step 1. Compactness: For the above defined u^ϵ_n, by direct calculations and the definition of ϕ^ϵ_n, we have

$$j(u^\epsilon_n) = (\imath u^\epsilon_n, \hat{\nabla} u^\epsilon_n) = |\rho^\epsilon_n|^2 \hat{\nabla}\phi^\epsilon_n = |\ln\epsilon||\rho^\epsilon_n|^2 v^\epsilon_n,$$

from which we have

$$v^{\epsilon,s} = \frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u^\epsilon_n)\chi_n = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} |\rho^\epsilon_n|^2 v^\epsilon_n \chi_n. \tag{4.22}$$

Note that, by the definition of ρ^ϵ_n and the properties of q^ϵ in (4.10), we have

$$\int_\Omega (1 - |\rho^\epsilon_n|^q)^r \, d\hat{x} \le \sum_{i=1}^{M^\epsilon_n} |B_\epsilon(a^\epsilon_{n,i})| = CM^\epsilon_n \epsilon^2.$$

It follows from (4.16) that

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\|1-|\rho_n^\epsilon|^q\|_{L^r(\Omega)}^r\to 0 \tag{4.23}$$

for all $1\le r<\infty$ and $0<q<\infty$ as $(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)$. Recall that for all n, one can write $v_{n,1}=-2\hat{\nabla}\times\hat{\Delta}_D^{-1}w_n$, where $v_{n,1}$ is given in (4.5). Given $p<\frac{3}{2}$, we have

$$\left\|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}(v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1})\chi_n\right\|_{L^p(D)}^p=s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\|v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p=s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left\|-2\hat{\nabla}\times\hat{\Delta}_D^{-1}(w_n^\epsilon-w_n)\right\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p.$$

It follows from standard elliptic estimates and (4.14) that

$$\left\|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}(v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1})\chi_n\right\|_{L^p(D)}^p\le sC\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\|w_n^\epsilon-w_n\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)}^p\to 0 \tag{4.24}$$

as $(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)$, where C is a constant depending only on Ω and p. It is clear from Lemma 4.2 that

$$\left\|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}v_{n,1}\chi_n-v_1\right\|_{L^p(D)}\to 0$$

as $s\to 0$. Therefore we conclude that

$$\left\|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}v_n^\epsilon\chi_n-v_1\right\|_{L^p(D)}\to 0. \tag{4.25}$$

For any $p<r<\frac{3}{2}$, using Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\left\|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left(|\rho_n^\epsilon|^2-1\right)v_n^\epsilon\chi_n\right\|_{L^p(D)}\le\left\|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left(|\rho_n^\epsilon|^2-1\right)\chi_n\right\|_{L^{\bar{r}}(D)}\left\|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}v_n^\epsilon\chi_n\right\|_{L^r(D)},$$

where $\frac{1}{r}+\frac{1}{\bar{r}}=\frac{1}{p}$. We deduce from (4.23) and (4.25) that

$$\left\|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left(|\rho_n^\epsilon|^2-1\right)v_n^\epsilon\chi_n\right\|_{L^p(D)}\to 0 \tag{4.26}$$

as $(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)$. Hence (4.2) follows from (4.22), (4.25) and (4.26), and (4.3) is a direct consequence.

Step 2. Decomposition of the energy: By the definition of u_n^ϵ, we have

$$|\hat{\nabla}u_n^\epsilon|^2=|\hat{\nabla}\rho_n^\epsilon|^2+(\rho_n^\epsilon)^2|\hat{\nabla}\phi_n^\epsilon|^2=|\hat{\nabla}\rho_n^\epsilon|^2+|\ln\epsilon|^2(\rho_n^\epsilon)^2|v_n^\epsilon|^2.$$

Therefore

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}E_\epsilon(u_n^\epsilon)=\frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega\left[|\hat{\nabla}\rho_n^\epsilon|^2+|\ln\epsilon|^2(\rho_n^\epsilon)^2|v_n^\epsilon|^2+\frac{\left(1-(\rho_n^\epsilon)^2\right)^2}{2\epsilon^2}\right]d\hat{x}.$$

Using the definition of ρ_n^ϵ, (4.10)-(4.11) and (4.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega\left[|\hat{\nabla}\rho_n^\epsilon|^2+\frac{|1-(\rho_n^\epsilon)^2|^2}{2\epsilon^2}\right]d\hat{x}&=s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_{\cup B_\epsilon(a_{n,i}^\epsilon)}\left[|\hat{\nabla}\rho_n^\epsilon|^2+\frac{|1-(\rho_n^\epsilon)^2|^2}{2\epsilon^2}\right]d\hat{x}\\&\le Cs\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}M_n^\epsilon\le C|\ln\epsilon|\|w\|_{L^1(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{s}{|\ln\epsilon|^2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}E_\epsilon(u_n^\epsilon)=\frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega(\rho_n^\epsilon)^2|v_n^\epsilon|^2d\hat{x}+o_\epsilon(1), \tag{4.27}$$

where $\lim_{\epsilon\to0}o_\epsilon(1)=0$. Let us write

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega(\rho_n^\epsilon)^2|v_n^\epsilon|^2d\hat{x}=&\frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega|v_{n,1}|^2d\hat{x}+s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega v_{n,1}\cdot(\rho_n^\epsilon v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1})\,d\hat{x}\\&+\frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega|\rho_n^\epsilon v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1}|^2\,d\hat{x}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

By Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega|v_{n,1}|^2d\hat{x}\to\frac{\|v_1\|_{L^2(D)}^2}{2} \tag{4.29}$$

as $s\to0$. By (4.24) and a similar argument as in (4.26), one can show

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}(\rho_n^\epsilon v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1})\,\chi_n\to0\quad\text{ in }L^p(D;\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{4.30}$$

In the following we show that

$$\frac{s}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega|\rho_n^\epsilon v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1}|^2d\hat{x}\le\|w\|_{L^1(D)}+o_{\epsilon,s}(1). \tag{4.31}$$

The above implies that $\{\sum(\rho_n^\epsilon v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1})\chi_n\}$ forms a bounded sequence in $L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$. It follows from this and (4.30) that, up to a subsequence, $\sum(\rho_n^\epsilon v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1})\,\chi_n$ converges weakly to 0 in L^2. Therefore we deduce from Lemma 4.2 that

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega v_{n,1}\cdot(\rho_n^\epsilon v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1})d\hat{x}\to0. \tag{4.32}$$

The upper bound (4.4) then follows from (4.27)-(4.32).

Step 3. Proof of (4.31)*:* As in the proof of Lemma 7.2 in [17], we define

$$\delta=\delta(\epsilon)=c_0|\ln\epsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}}/3,$$

where c_0 is the constant in (4.13). Recall that we defined the function $\eta:\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{R}$ to be the standard mollifier with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta=1$. Using an elementary inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\|\rho_n^\epsilon v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\\&\quad\le s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left(4\|\rho_n^\epsilon v_n^\epsilon-\eta^\epsilon*v_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2+2\|\eta^\epsilon*v_n^\epsilon-\eta^\delta*v_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2+4\|\eta^\delta*v_n^\epsilon-v_{n,1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\right)\\&\quad=s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left(4A_n^\epsilon+2B_n^\epsilon+4C_n^\epsilon\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

Here we use the convention that $\eta^r * v_n^\epsilon = v_n^\epsilon$ if $\mathrm{dist}(\hat{x}, \partial\Omega) < r$.

According to (7.17) in [17], we have $\|\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \le C$ for all $q < \infty$ and for some constant C independent of ϵ and s. Using the fact that $sN = L$ is fixed, we obtain

$$\left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon)\chi_n \right\|_{L^q(D)}^q = s \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q \le C \tag{4.34}$$

for some constant C independent of ϵ and s. Since $w = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{curl} v \in C^\infty(\overline{D})$, we have $w_n \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Recall that $v_{n,1} = -2\hat{\nabla} \times \hat{\Delta}_D^{-1} w_n$. It follows from global elliptic regularity that $\|v_{n,1}\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \le C$ for all $q < \infty$ and for some constant C depending only on $\|w\|_\infty$, Ω and q. Therefore, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} v_{n,1}\chi_n \right\|_{L^q(D)}^q \le C. \tag{4.35}$$

Given $p < \frac{3}{2}$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon - v_{n,1})\chi_n \right\|_{L^p(D)} \le \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon - v_n^\epsilon)\chi_n \right\|_{L^p(D)} + \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (v_n^\epsilon - v_{n,1})\chi_n \right\|_{L^p(D)}.$$

The second term in the above right-hand side converges to zero by (4.24). The first term also converges to zero by approximation to identity along with the compactness (4.24). Hence we have

$$\left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon - v_{n,1})\chi_n \right\|_{L^p(D)} \to 0.$$

Using (4.34) and (4.35), it is clear that $\{\sum(\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon - v_{n,1})\chi_n\}$ is bounded in $L^q(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $q < \infty$. Therefore, we deduce from an interpolation inequality that

$$s \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} C_n^\epsilon = \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon - v_{n,1})\chi_n \right\|_{L^2(D)}^2 \to 0. \tag{4.36}$$

From the proof of Lemma 7.2 in [17], we have

$$B_n^\epsilon \le \pi \frac{M_n^\epsilon}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \left(\ln\left(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon}\right) + C \right),$$

and

$$A_n^\epsilon \le C \int_\Omega (1 - \rho_n^\epsilon)^2 \left(|\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon|^2 + C|\ln \epsilon|^{-1} \right) d\hat{x},$$

where the above constants C are independent of ϵ and s. Therefore, noting that $\ln \delta < 0$ and using (4.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} s \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} B_n^\epsilon &\le s \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \pi \frac{M_n^\epsilon}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \left(\ln\left(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon}\right) + C \right) \\ &\le s \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \pi \frac{M_n^\epsilon}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \left(|\ln \epsilon| + C \right) \le \|w\|_{L^1(D)} + o_{\epsilon,s}(1). \end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

Using Hölder's and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities, we have

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}A_n^\epsilon \le C\left(s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega (1-\rho_n^\epsilon)^4 d\hat{x}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega |\eta^\delta * v_n^\epsilon|^4 d\hat{x}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{C}{|\ln\epsilon|}s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega (1-\rho_n^\epsilon)^2 d\hat{x}.$$

We deduce from (4.23) and (4.34) that

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}A_n^\epsilon \to 0. \tag{4.38}$$

The estimate (4.31) follows from (4.33) and (4.36)-(4.38). □

4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1 completed

Lemma 4.6. *Let v_2 be as in Lemma 4.2. There exists a sequence $\{u_n^\epsilon\}_{n=0}^N \subset [H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})]^{N+1}$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u_n^\epsilon)\chi_n \to v_2 \quad \text{in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2) \tag{4.39}$$

and

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\frac{E_\epsilon(u_n^\epsilon)}{|\ln\epsilon|^2} \to \frac{\|v_2\|_{L^2(D)}^2}{2} \tag{4.40}$$

as $(\epsilon, s)\to(0,0)$.

Proof. Since $v_{n,2}\in\mathscr{G}$ for all n, we have $v_{n,2}=\hat{\nabla}g_n$ for some $g_n\in H^1(\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{curl}v_{n,2}=0$. Define $u_n^\epsilon = e^{i|\ln\epsilon|g_n}$. By simple calculations, we have

$$|\hat{\nabla}u_n^\epsilon|^2 = |\ln\epsilon|^2|\hat{\nabla}g_n|^2 = |\ln\epsilon|^2|v_{n,2}|^2 \tag{4.41}$$

and

$$j(u_n^\epsilon) = |\ln\epsilon|v_{n,2}. \tag{4.42}$$

It follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$\frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u_n^\epsilon)\chi_n = v_2^s \to v_2 \quad \text{in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Using (4.41) and the fact that $|u_n^\epsilon|=1$, we have

$$E_\epsilon(u_n^\epsilon) = \frac{|\ln\epsilon|^2}{2}\|v_{n,2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

It follows from Lemma 4.2 again that (4.40) holds. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $\{u_{n,1}^\epsilon\}$ and $\{u_{n,2}^\epsilon\}$ be the sequences constructed in Lemmas 4.3 and 4.6, respectively. Define $u_n^\epsilon = u_{n,1}^\epsilon u_{n,2}^\epsilon$. We show that the sequence $\{u_n^\epsilon\}$ satisfies the conclusions of Theorem 4.1.

To show compactness, by direct calculations, we have $j(u_n^\epsilon) = j(u_{n,1}^\epsilon) + j(u_{n,2}^\epsilon)|u_{n,1}^\epsilon|^2$. By Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u_{n,1}^\epsilon)\chi_n \to v_1 \quad \text{in } L^p(D;\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ for all } p<\frac{3}{2}. \tag{4.43}$$

Using (4.42), we have

$$\frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u^\epsilon_{n,2})|u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2\chi_n - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} v_{n,2}\chi_n = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} v_{n,2}(|u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2-1)\chi_n.$$

Therefore, given $p<\frac{3}{2}$, using Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u^\epsilon_{n,2})|u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2\chi_n - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} v_{n,2}\chi_n\right\|_p^p &= s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left\|v_{n,2}(|u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2-1)\right\|_p^p\\ &\le s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\|v_{n,2}\|_2^p\cdot\left\|1-|u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2\right\|_{\frac{2p}{2-p}}^p\\ &\le \left(s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\|v_{n,2}\|_2^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\left(s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left\|1-|u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2\right\|_{\frac{2p}{2-p}}^{\frac{2p}{2-p}}\right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 4.2 and (4.23) that the above right side converges to zero, and therefore, we have

$$\frac{1}{|\ln\epsilon|}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u^\epsilon_{n,2})|u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2\chi_n \to v_2 \quad \text{in } L^p(D;\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ for all } p<\frac{3}{2}. \tag{4.44}$$

Combining (4.43) with (4.44) and using $v_1+v_2=v$, we have (4.2), and (4.3) is an immediate consequence.

To show (4.4), by direct computations using the fact $|u^\epsilon_{n,2}|=1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\hat\nabla u^\epsilon_n|^2 &= |\hat\nabla u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2 + |u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2|\hat\nabla u^\epsilon_{n,2}|^2 + 2j(u^\epsilon_{n,1})\cdot j(u^\epsilon_{n,2})\\ &\le |\hat\nabla u^\epsilon_{n,1}|^2 + |\hat\nabla u^\epsilon_{n,2}|^2 + 2j(u^\epsilon_{n,1})\cdot j(u^\epsilon_{n,2}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using $|u^\epsilon_{n,2}|=1$ again, we have

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\frac{E_\epsilon(u^\epsilon_n)}{|\ln\epsilon|^2} \le s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\frac{E_\epsilon(u^\epsilon_{n,1})}{|\ln\epsilon|^2} + s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\frac{E_\epsilon(u^\epsilon_{n,2})}{|\ln\epsilon|^2} + s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega \frac{j(u^\epsilon_{n,1})}{|\ln\epsilon|}\cdot\frac{j(u^\epsilon_{n,2})}{|\ln\epsilon|}d\hat x. \tag{4.45}$$

Since $|j(u^\epsilon_{n,1})|\le|\hat\nabla u^\epsilon_{n,1}|$, it follows from Lemma 4.3 that the sequence $\{\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{j(u^\epsilon_{n,1})}{|\ln\epsilon|}\chi_n\}$ is bounded in $L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$. Since the sequence converges strongly to v_1 in $L^p(D)$ for $p<\frac{3}{2}$, we conclude that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{j(u^\epsilon_{n,1})}{|\ln\epsilon|}\chi_n \rightharpoonup v_1 \quad \text{in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{4.46}$$

We deduce from (4.46), (4.39) and Lemma 4.2 that

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N}\int_\Omega \frac{j(u^\epsilon_{n,1})}{|\ln\epsilon|}\cdot\frac{j(u^\epsilon_{n,2})}{|\ln\epsilon|}d\hat x \to \int_D v_1\cdot v_2 dx = 0. \tag{4.47}$$

Finally, the estimate (4.4) follows from (4.45), (4.47) and Lemmas 4.3 and 4.6, and the fact that $\|v\|_{L^2}^2 = \|v_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v_2\|_{L^2}^2$. □

5 Construction of the magnetic potential

In this section, we construct the magnetic potential $\vec{A}$ for the recovery sequence. Let $(v_0, \vec{A}_0) \in V \times K_0$ be a minimizer of $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$. By direct variation in $\vec{A}$, we have that, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$-\Delta(A_0^i - h_0 a^i) = (v_0^i - A_0^i)\chi_D.$$

By the definition of the space K_0 in (1.9), we have $A_0^i - h_0 a^i \in L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$A_0^i - h_0 a^i = \int_D \frac{c}{|x-y|}(v_0^i - A_0^i)(y)dy, \tag{5.1}$$

where $c = \frac{1}{4\pi}$ (see [12]). By standard elliptic estimates, since $v_0^i - A_0^i \in L^2(D)$, we have $A_0^i - h_0 a^i \in H^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset W^{1,p}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset C^{0,\gamma}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Recall that we have fixed the vector field $\vec{a} = (-\frac{x_2}{2}, \frac{x_1}{2}, 0) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$. Therefore, one can define the restrictions of A_0^i on the layers in the classical sense.

We define

$$\vec{A}^\epsilon(x) = |\ln\epsilon|\vec{A}_0(x) + (h_{ex} - h_0|\ln\epsilon|)\,\vec{a}(x) \in K, \tag{5.2}$$

so that

$$\frac{\vec{A}^\epsilon - h_{ex}\vec{a}}{|\ln\epsilon|} = \vec{A}_0 - h_0\vec{a},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2|\ln\epsilon|^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left|\nabla\times\vec{A}^\epsilon - h_{ex}\vec{e}_3\right|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left|\nabla\times\vec{A}_0 - h_0\vec{e}_3\right|^2 dx. \tag{5.3}$$

The main result of this section is the following a priori estimate:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\vec{A}^\epsilon$ be defined as in* (5.2)*. Then we have*

$$\hat{A}^{\epsilon,s} := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{\hat{A}^\epsilon_n}{|\ln\epsilon|}\chi_n \to \hat{A}_0 \quad \text{in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$$

as $s \to 0$, where $\hat{A}^\epsilon_n(\hat{x}) = \big(A^{\epsilon,1}(\hat{x}, ns), A^{\epsilon,2}(\hat{x}, ns)\big)$.

The above theorem plays a crucial role in proving compactness of quantities involving the magnetic potential $\vec{A}^\epsilon$. The key step in the proof of Theorem 5.1 is the following Lemma 5.2, which generalizes Theorem 3.1 to the continuous case. For $i = 1, 2$, we define $A^i_{0,n}(\hat{x}) = A^i_0(\hat{x}, ns)$, and $g^i_0(x) = v^i_0(x) - A^i_0(x)$. We denote $D_n = \Omega \times (ns, (n+1)s)$ for all $n = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1$. In the following lemma, we omit the subscript 0, and prove

Lemma 5.2. *Let $A^i (= A^i_0)$ be as above. Then we have*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left\|A^i_n(\hat{x})\chi_n(x_3) - A^i(\hat{x}, x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} \le Cs^{4\alpha-2}\left\|g^i\right\|^2_{L^2(D)}$$

for all $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$ and for some constant C depending only on D. In particular, we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left\|A^i_n(\hat{x})\chi_n(x_3) - A^i(\hat{x}, x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} \to 0$$

as $s \to 0$.

Proof. Fix some $n \in \{0, 1, \cdots, N-1\}$, and let $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$ be a constant. By the representation formula (5.1), for $x \in D_n$, we have

$$A_n^i(\hat{x}) - A^i(\hat{x}, x_3) = \int_D \frac{c}{|(\hat{x}, ns) - y|} g^i(y) dy - \int_D \frac{c}{|(\hat{x}, x_3) - y|} g^i(y) dy. \tag{5.4}$$

Let $\delta = \delta(\alpha, s) := s^{1-\alpha}$. We denote $D_n^b = \{x \in D : \text{dist}(x, \overline{D}_n) < 2\delta\}$ and $D_n^g = D \setminus \overline{D_n^b}$. Define

$$h^b(x) = \int_D \frac{c}{|x-y|} g^i(y) \chi_{D_n^b}(y) dy,$$

and

$$h^g(x) = \int_D \frac{c}{|x-y|} g^i(y) \chi_{D_n^g}(y) dy.$$

Using (5.4), we write

$$A_n^i(\hat{x}) - A^i(\hat{x}, x_3) = \left(h^b(\hat{x}, ns) - h^b(x)\right) + \left(h^g(\hat{x}, ns) - h^g(x)\right). \tag{5.5}$$

Let $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded open set such that $\overline{\Omega} \subset \tilde{\Omega}$, and $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\tilde{\Omega}) \geq \delta$. We denote $\tilde{D}_n = \tilde{\Omega} \times (ns - \delta, (n+1)s + \delta)$. It is clear that, for all $x \in D_n$, $\text{dist}(x, \partial\tilde{D}_n) \geq \delta$. Note that h^g is harmonic in $\tilde{D}_n$. By interior estimates for harmonic functions (see, e.g., [12]), for all $x \in D_n$, we have

$$|h^g(\hat{x}, ns) - h^g(x)| \leq s \sup_{D_n} |\partial_3 h^g| \leq s \cdot \frac{2}{\delta} \sup_{\tilde{D}_n} |h^g|.$$

To estimate $\sup_{\tilde{D}_n} |h^g|$, note that, for any $x \in \tilde{D}_n$ and $y \in D_n^g$, we have $|x - y| \geq \delta$. It follows from the definition of h^g and Hölder's inequality that

$$\sup_{\tilde{D}_n} |h^g(x)| \leq c\delta^{-1} \left| \int_D g^i(y) \chi_{D_n^g}(y) dy \right| \leq C(D)\delta^{-1} \|g^i\|_{L^2(D)}.$$

Therefore, using $\delta = s^{1-\alpha}$, we have

$$|h^g(\hat{x}, ns) - h^g(x)|^2 \leq C(D) s^2 \delta^{-4} \|g^i\|_{L^2(D)}^2 = C(D) s^{4\alpha - 2} \|g^i\|_{L^2(D)}^2.$$

From the above, we deduce that

$$\|h^g(\hat{x}, ns) - h^g(x)\|_{L^2(D_n)}^2 \leq C s^{4\alpha - 1} \|g^i\|_{L^2(D)}^2. \tag{5.6}$$

By standard interior elliptic estimates, we have that $\|h^b\|_{H^2(D_n)} \leq C \left(\|h^b\|_{L^2(\tilde{D}_n)} + \|g^i \chi_{D_n^b}\|_{L^2(\tilde{D}_n)} \right)$. Using the definition of h^b and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tilde{D}_n} |h^b|^2 dx &\leq \int_{\tilde{D}_n} \left(\int_D \frac{c}{|x-y|} |g^i(y)| \chi_{D_n^b}(y) dy \right)^2 dx \\ &\leq C \int_{\tilde{D}_n} \left(\int_{D_n^b} \frac{1}{|x-y|^2} dy \right) \left(\int_{D_n^b} |g^i(y)|^2 dy \right) dx \leq C \|g^i\|_{L^2(D_n^b)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\|h^b\|_{H^2(D_n)} \leq C \|g^i\|_{L^2(D_n^b)} \leq C \|g^i\|_{L^2(D)}. \tag{5.7}$$

Note that, for all $x \in D_n$, we have

$$|h^b(\hat{x}, x_3) - h^b(\hat{x}, ns)|^2 \leq \left(\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s} \left| \partial_3 h^b(\hat{x}, t) \right| dt \right)^2 \leq s \int_{ns}^{(n+1)s} |\partial_3 h^b|^2 dx_3.$$

We deduce from (5.7) and the above that

$$\|h^b(\hat{x}, ns)\chi_n - h^b(x)\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} \leq s^2 \|\partial_3 h^b\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} \leq C s^2 \|g^i\|^2_{L^2(D)}. \tag{5.8}$$

Using (5.5) and an elementary inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|A^i_n(\hat{x}) - A^i(\hat{x}, x_3)\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} \\ &\qquad \leq 2 \left(\|h^g(\hat{x}, ns) - h^g(x)\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} + \|h^b(\hat{x}, ns) - h^b(x)\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Putting (5.6) and (5.8) into the above, we obtain

$$\|A^i_n(\hat{x}) - A^i(\hat{x}, x_3)\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} \leq C(s^{4\alpha-1} + s^2) \|g^i\|^2_{L^2(D)}. \tag{5.9}$$

Taking the sum in (5.9) over all n and noting that $sN = L$ is fixed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|A^i_n(\hat{x}) - A^i(\hat{x}, x_3)\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} &\leq CN(s^{4\alpha-1} + s^2) \|g^i\|^2_{L^2(D)} \\ &= CL(s^{4\alpha-2} + s) \|g^i\|^2_{L^2(D)} \\ &\leq \tilde{C} s^{4\alpha-2} \|g^i\|^2_{L^2(D)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$. As an immediate consequence, it is clear that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left\| A^i_n(\hat{x}) - A^i(\hat{x}, x_3) \right\|^2_{L^2(D_n)} \to 0$$

as $s \to 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By the definition of $\vec{A}^\epsilon$ in (5.2), we have

$$\frac{\hat{A}^\epsilon_n}{|\ln \epsilon|} = \hat{A}_{0,n} + \left(\frac{h_{ex}}{|\ln \epsilon|} - h_0 \right) \hat{a}_n,$$

where $\hat{a}_n$ is the restriction of (a^1, a^2) on $\Omega_n = \Omega \times \{ns\}$. Therefore, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{\hat{A}^\epsilon_n}{|\ln \epsilon|} \chi_n - \hat{A}_0 \right\|_{L^2(D)} \leq \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \hat{A}_{0,n} \chi_n - \hat{A}_0 \right\|_{L^2(D)} + \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(\frac{h_{ex}}{|\ln \epsilon|} - h_0 \right) \hat{a}_n \chi_n \right\|_{L^2(D)}.$$

Since $\vec{a}$ is independent of x_3 and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{h_{ex}}{|\ln \epsilon|} = h_0$, it is clear that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(\frac{h_{ex}}{|\ln \epsilon|} - h_0 \right) \hat{a}_n \chi_n \right\|_{L^2(D)} \to 0.$$

This along with Lemma 5.2 give Theorem 5.1. □

6 Proof of Theorem 1: completed

In this section, we complete the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1. Then we give the proof of Corollary 1 in the introduction.

Proof of (1.16). Let $(v_0, \vec{A}_0) \in V \times K_0$ be a minimizer of $\mathcal{G}_{h_0}$. Using Proposition 2.2, we can find a sequence $\{v_k\} \subset V \cap C^\infty(\overline{D}; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that (2.5)-(2.6) hold. Using Theorem 4.1 for each v_k and a diagonal argument, we can find $\{u_n^\epsilon\}$ such that

$$v^{\epsilon,s} := \frac{1}{|\ln \epsilon|} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} j(u_n^\epsilon)\chi_n \to v_0 \quad \text{in } L^p(D;\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ for all } p < \frac{3}{2},$$

$$w^{\epsilon,s} := \frac{1}{|\ln \epsilon|} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} J(u_n^\epsilon)\chi_n \rightharpoonup w_0 \quad \text{in } W^{-1,p}(D) \text{ for all } p < \frac{3}{2},$$

and

$$\limsup_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} s \sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{E_\epsilon(u_n^\epsilon)}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \le \frac{\|v_0\|^2_{L^2(D)}}{2} + |w_0|(D), \tag{6.1}$$

where $w_0 = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{curl} v_0$. Define $\vec{A}^\epsilon$ as in (5.2). By the energy upper bound (6.1) and the proof of Lemma 3.4, it is clear that the configurations $(\{u_n^\epsilon\}, \vec{A}^\epsilon)$ satisfy the compactness estimates in Theorem 1.

Next let us calculate the energy $\mathcal{G}_{LD}^{\epsilon,s}(\{u_n^\epsilon\}, \vec{A}^\epsilon)$ using the decomposition formula (3.1). It follows from (1.12) and Theorem 5.1 that

$$\frac{s}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \sum_n \int_\Omega (\hat{\nabla} u_n^\epsilon, \imath u_n^\epsilon) \cdot \hat{A}_n^\epsilon d\hat{x} = \int_D v^{\epsilon,s} \cdot \hat{A}^{\epsilon,s} dx \to \int_D v_0 \cdot \hat{A}_0 dx. \tag{6.2}$$

Next, using $|u_n^\epsilon| \le 1$ and Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\limsup_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} \frac{s}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \sum_n \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|u_n^\epsilon|^2 |\hat{A}_n^\epsilon|^2 d\hat{x} \le \lim_{(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)} \frac{s}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \sum_n \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\hat{A}_n^\epsilon|^2 d\hat{x} = \frac{1}{2}\|\hat{A}_0\|^2_{L^2(D)}. \tag{6.3}$$

Using $|u_n^\epsilon| \le 1$ and the assumption (1.14), it is clear that

$$\frac{s}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2\lambda^2 s^2} \left| u_{n+1} - u_n e^{\imath \int_{ns}^{(n+1)s} A^3 dx_3} \right|^2 d\hat{x} \to 0. \tag{6.4}$$

Finally, plugging (6.1)-(6.4) and (5.3) into (3.1), we obtain (1.16). This completes the proof of Theorem 1. □

Finally, we prove Corollary 1 in Section 1.

Proof of Corollary 1. From the Euler-Lagrange equations (1.2), we have

$$\nabla \times (\nabla \times \vec{A}) = (j_1, j_2, j_3) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where j_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are given in (1.3). Using the fact $|u_n| \le 1$ and the assumption (1.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{j_3}{|\ln \epsilon|} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\le \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{ns}^{(n+1)s} \int_\Omega \frac{s^2}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \frac{1}{\lambda^4 s^4} \left| u_{n+1} - u_n e^{\imath \int_{ns}^{(n+1)s} A^3 dx_3} \right|^2 d\hat{x} dx_3 \\ &\le CNs \cdot \frac{s^2}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} \frac{1}{\lambda^4 s^4} = \frac{CL}{\lambda^4} \cdot \frac{1}{s^2 |\ln \epsilon|^2} \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

For $i=1,2$, define

$$\tilde{j}_i=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}(\partial_i u_n-\imath A_n^i u_n,\imath u_n)\chi_n(x_3)=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}(\partial_i u_n,\imath u_n)\chi_n(x_3)-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}A_n^i|u_n|^2\chi_n(x_3).$$

Let $\varphi\in C_c(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be a test function. It follows from the definitions of j_i and $\tilde{j}_i$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\varphi d(j_i-\tilde{j}_i)=&\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s}\int_\Omega(\partial_i u_n-\imath A_n^i u_n,\imath u_n)\left(\varphi(\hat{x},ns)-\varphi(\hat{x},x_3)\right)d\hat{x}dx_3\\&+s\int_\Omega(\partial_i u_N-\imath A_N^i u_N,\imath u_N)\varphi(\hat{x},Ns)d\hat{x}=I+II.\end{aligned}\tag{6.6}$$

Using $|u_n|\le 1$ and the uniform continuity of φ, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|I|&\le\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_{ns}^{(n+1)s}\int_\Omega\left|\partial_i u_n-\imath A_n^i u_n\right|\left|\varphi(\hat{x},ns)-\varphi(\hat{x},x_3)\right|d\hat{x}dx_3\\&\le o_s(1)s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega\left|\partial_i u_n-\imath A_n^i u_n\right|d\hat{x}\\&\le o_s(1)C(\Omega)s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left(\int_\Omega\left|\partial_i u_n-\imath A_n^i u_n\right|^2d\hat{x}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\&\le o_s(1)C(\Omega)s^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_\Omega\left|\partial_i u_n-\imath A_n^i u_n\right|^2d\hat{x}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where in the last two steps in the above, we have used Hölder's and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities. Here $o_s(1)\to 0$ as $s\to 0$ and depends only on φ. Using the upper bound (3.3) and noticing that $\partial_i u_n-\imath A_n^i u_n$ is the ith component of $\hat{\nabla}_{\hat{A}_n}u_n$, we obtain from the above that

$$\frac{|I|}{|\ln\epsilon|}\le o_s(1)Cs^{\frac{1}{2}}\to 0\tag{6.7}$$

as $(\epsilon,s)\to(0,0)$. Similarly, using (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|II|}{|\ln\epsilon|}&\le\sup|\varphi|\frac{s}{|\ln\epsilon|}\int_\Omega\left|\partial_i u_N-\imath A_N^i u_N\right|d\hat{x}\\&\le\sup|\varphi|\frac{s^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\ln\epsilon|}\left(s\int_\Omega\left|\partial_i u_N-\imath A_N^i u_N\right|^2d\hat{x}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\le C\sup|\varphi|s^{\frac{1}{2}}\to 0.\end{aligned}\tag{6.8}$$

Putting (6.6)-(6.8) together, we deduce

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\varphi d\frac{j_i-\tilde{j}_i}{|\ln\epsilon|}\to 0.\tag{6.9}$$

By the compactness (1.12), up to a subsequence, we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{(\imath u_n,\hat{\nabla}u_n)}{|\ln\epsilon|}\chi_n(x_3)\rightharpoonup v_0\quad\text{ in }L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2).\tag{6.10}$$

It follows from the upper bound (3.3) again that

$$s\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\int_{\Omega}\left(1-|u_n|^2\right)^2 d\hat{x} \le C\epsilon^2|\ln\epsilon|^2 \to 0.$$

Using the above and arguments similar to those in the proof of (3.36), one can show that, up to a subsequence,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{A_n^i|u_n|^2}{|\ln\epsilon|}\chi_n(x_3) \to A_0^i \quad \text{ in } L^2(D). \tag{6.11}$$

Using the definition of $\tilde{j}_i$ and (6.9)-(6.11), we immediately obtain that, up to a subsequence,

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\varphi d\frac{j_i}{|\ln\epsilon|} - \int_D \varphi(v_0^i - A_0^i)dx\right| \to 0,$$

from which we conclude

$$\frac{j_i}{|\ln\epsilon|} \rightharpoonup (v_0^i - A_0^i)\chi_D \quad \text{ in } \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^3). \tag{6.12}$$

Corollary 1 then follows from (6.5) and (6.12). □

A Appendix

In this appendix, we prove Proposition 2.2. We begin with the following local approximation result, whose proof adapts that for BV functions (see, e.g., [11]):

Lemma A.1. *Assume $v \in V$. There exists a sequence $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset V \cap C^{\infty}(D;\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that*

$$v_k \to v \quad \text{ in } L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2) \tag{A.1}$$

and

$$|curlv_k|(D) \to |curlv|(D) \tag{A.2}$$

as $k \to \infty$.

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Given some positive integer m, define

$$D_k = \{x \in D : \text{dist}(x, \partial D) > \frac{1}{m+k}\}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We may choose m sufficiently large such that

$$|\text{curl}v|(D \setminus D_1) < \epsilon. \tag{A.3}$$

Denote $U_k = D_{k+1} \setminus \overline{D}_{k-1}$ with the convention $U_1 = D_2$. Let the sequence $\{\zeta_k\}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to $\{U_k\}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_k \in C_c^{\infty}(U_k), \\ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\zeta_k = 1 \text{ on } D. \end{cases} \tag{A.4}$$

Let η be the standard mollifier. For each k, choose $\epsilon_k > 0$ sufficiently small such that

$$\begin{cases} \eta_{\epsilon_k} * (v\zeta_k) \in C_c^{\infty}(U_k), \\ \|\eta_{\epsilon_k} * (v\zeta_k) - v\zeta_k\|_{L^2(U_k;\mathbb{R}^2)} < \frac{\epsilon}{2^k}, \\ \|\eta_{\epsilon_k} * (v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^{\perp}\zeta_k) - v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^{\perp}\zeta_k\|_{L^1(U_k)} < \frac{\epsilon}{2^k}. \end{cases} \tag{A.5}$$

Define

$$v_\epsilon = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \eta_{\epsilon_k} * (v\zeta_k). \tag{A.6}$$

It is clear that $v_\epsilon \in C^\infty(D)$. By (A.5), we have

$$\|v - v_\epsilon\|_{L^2(D;\mathbb{R}^2)} < \epsilon \to 0 \tag{A.7}$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$. Let $\varphi \in C_c^1(D)$ be a test function such that $\sup|\varphi| \le 1$. It follows from (A.7) that

$$-\int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi = -\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \int_D v_\epsilon \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi \le \liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} |\mathrm{curl} v_\epsilon|(D).$$

Hence we have

$$|\mathrm{curl} v|(D) \le \liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} |\mathrm{curl} v_\epsilon|(D). \tag{A.8}$$

Next, using the definition of v_ϵ in (A.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-\int_D v_\epsilon \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi &= -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_D \eta_{\epsilon_k} * (v\zeta_k) \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi \\
&= -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_D v\zeta_k \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\eta_{\epsilon_k} * \varphi) \\
&= -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\zeta_k (\eta_{\epsilon_k} * \varphi)) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \zeta_k (\eta_{\epsilon_k} * \varphi) \\
&= -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\zeta_k (\eta_{\epsilon_k} * \varphi)) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_D \left(\eta_{\epsilon_k} * (v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \zeta_k) - v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \zeta_k \right) \varphi \\
&= I_1^\epsilon + I_2^\epsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

Here we have used $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \hat{\nabla}^\perp \zeta_k = \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \zeta_k) = 0$, which is a consequence of the definition of ζ_k in (A.4). By (A.5), we have $I_2^\epsilon \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. For I_1^ϵ, we have

$$-\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\zeta_k (\eta_{\epsilon_k} * \varphi)) = -\int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\zeta_1 (\eta_{\epsilon_1} * \varphi)) - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\zeta_k (\eta_{\epsilon_k} * \varphi)).$$

Note that, since $\sup|\varphi| \le 1$, we have $|\zeta_k (\eta_{\epsilon_k} * \varphi)| \le 1$. Therefore, we have

$$-\int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\zeta_1 (\eta_{\epsilon_1} * \varphi)) \le |\mathrm{curl} v|(D) \quad \text{and} \quad -\int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\zeta_k (\eta_{\epsilon_k} * \varphi)) \le |\mathrm{curl} v|(U_k).$$

Note that each point in D belongs to at most three sets of $\{U_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$. Hence, using (A.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_D v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp (\zeta_k (\eta_{\epsilon_k} * \varphi)) &\le |\mathrm{curl} v|(D) + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |\mathrm{curl} v|(U_k) \\
&\le |\mathrm{curl} v|(D) + 3|\mathrm{curl} v|(D \setminus D_1) \le |\mathrm{curl} v|(D) + 3\epsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

We deduce from (A.9) and (A.10) that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0} |\mathrm{curl} v_\epsilon|(D) \le |\mathrm{curl} v|(D). \tag{A.11}$$

Combining (A.11) with (A.8), we obtain (A.2). □

Next we show that the above local approximation can be improved to global approximation, given that our domain D is sufficiently smooth. We do this by showing that, for every $v \in V$, one can extend it to some $\tilde{v} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\mathrm{curl}\tilde{v}$ is a finite Radon measure and $|\mathrm{curl}\tilde{v}|(\partial D) = 0$. Such arguments follow the extension techniques for BV functions in Lipschitz domains. (See, e.g., [4], Chapter 3.) In the following, for an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, we define

$$V(U) := \{v \in L^2(U;\mathbb{R}^2) : \mathrm{curl}v \in \mathcal{M}(U)\}.$$

Lemma A.2. *There exists an extension operator $T : V(D) \to V(\mathbb{R}^3)$, such that, for all $v \in V(D)$, $Tv|_D = v$ and $|curlTv|(\partial D) = 0$.*

Proof. The proof is divided into four steps.

Step 1. First, we make some simplifications. Since $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a smooth domain, we can find finitely many open rectangles $\{R_i\}$ such that $\overline{\Omega} \subset \cup_i R_i$, and each R_i satisfies either $R_i \subset \Omega$ or $R_i \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$. If $R_i \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$, by a rotation and translation, we may assume that $\partial\Omega \cap R_i$ is the graph of a smooth function defined on one side of R_i, and that it does not intersect with this side and the opposite side of R_i. Let $\{\zeta_i\}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to the covering $\{R_i\}$. Let $Q_i = R_i \times (0, L)$. We only need to define appropriate extensions T_i on each Q_i that satisfy the conclusions of Lemma A.2. Then we can define $Tv = \sum_i T_i v_i$ with $v_i = v\zeta_i$ in $\cup_i Q_i$, and extend Tv to be zero in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \cup_i Q_i$. One can check that $Tv \in V(\mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfies the conclusions of Lemma A.2. Now we fix some R_i with $R_i \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$. By a rotation and dilation, we may assume $R_i = l \times (-1, 1)$ for some open interval $l \subset \mathbb{R}$. By a smooth deformation, we may assume that $R_i \cap \Omega = l \times (0, 1)$. Such simplifications are standard in the BV setting. (See, e.g., [4], Chapter 3.) In the following, we define the extension T_i on Q_i. We omit the subscript i in the rest of the proof. We denote $Q^+ = Q \cap D$, $Q^- = Q \setminus \overline{Q^+}$, and $\Gamma = Q \cap \partial D$.

Step 2. Assume $v \in C^\infty(\overline{Q^+})$. We define T to be a reflection across Γ:

$$Tv(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \begin{cases} \big(v^1(x_1, x_2, x_3), v^2(x_1, x_2, x_3)\big) & \text{if } x \in \overline{Q^+}, \\ \big(v^1(x_1, -x_2, x_3), -v^2(x_1, -x_2, x_3)\big) & \text{if } x \in Q^-. \end{cases} \tag{A.12}$$

One can easily check that $Tv \in V(Q)$ and $|\mathrm{curl}Tv|(\Gamma) = 0$. Moreover, we have $|\mathrm{curl}Tv|(Q) \leq 2|\mathrm{curl}v|(Q^+)$.

Step 3. Assume $v \in C^\infty(Q^+)$. We define Tv as in (A.12) in Q^-. It is clear that $Tv \in L^2(Q)$. Let $Q^+_\epsilon = \{x \in Q : x_2 > \epsilon\}$ and $\Gamma_\epsilon = \{x \in Q : x_2 = \epsilon\}$. We define $v^\epsilon(x_1, x_2, x_3) = v(x_1, x_2 + \epsilon, x_3)$. Let $\tau = (1, 0, 0)$ and $(v^\epsilon)_\tau = v^\epsilon(x_1, 0, x_3) \cdot \tau$ be the planar tangential component of v on Γ_ϵ, where we identity $2D$ vector fields as $3D$ vector fields with the x_3 component equal to zero. Let $\varphi \in C^1_c(Q)$ be a test function with $\sup|\varphi| \leq 1$. Using an integration by parts, and noting that v has compact support in Q^+ with respect to the sides of Q, we have

$$-\int_{Q^+} v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx = -\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\int_{Q^+_\epsilon} v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\left(\int_{Q^+_\epsilon} \mathrm{curl}v\varphi dx - \int_{\Gamma_\epsilon} (v\varphi)\cdot\tau d\mathcal{H}^2\right).$$

Since $\mathrm{curl}v \in (L^1(Q^+))$, we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\int_{Q^+_\epsilon} \mathrm{curl}v\varphi dx = \int_{Q^+} \mathrm{curl}v\varphi dx.$$

It follows that $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\int_{\Gamma_\epsilon}(v\varphi)\cdot\tau d\mathcal{H}^2$ exists and

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\int_{\Gamma_\epsilon}(v\varphi)\cdot\tau d\mathcal{H}^2 = \int_{Q^+} v\cdot\hat{\nabla}^\perp\varphi dx + \int_{Q^+}\mathrm{curl}v\varphi dx. \tag{A.13}$$

Using an integration by parts, we have that

$$\int_\Gamma (v^\epsilon \varphi^\epsilon - v^\epsilon \varphi)\cdot \tau d\mathcal{H}^2 = \int_{Q^+} (\mathrm{curl} v^\epsilon \varphi^\epsilon - \mathrm{curl} v^\epsilon \varphi) dx + \int_{Q^+} v^\epsilon \cdot (\hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi^\epsilon - \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi) dx. \tag{A.14}$$

Since $\varphi^\epsilon \to \varphi$ uniformly and $\mathrm{curl} v^\epsilon$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(Q^+)$, we have

$$\int_{Q^+} (\mathrm{curl} v^\epsilon \varphi^\epsilon - \mathrm{curl} v^\epsilon \varphi) dx \to 0. \tag{A.15}$$

A similar argument yields

$$\int_{Q^+} v^\epsilon \cdot (\hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi^\epsilon - \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi) dx \to 0. \tag{A.16}$$

Therefore, we conclude from (A.13)-(A.16) that

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \int_\Gamma (v^\epsilon \varphi)\cdot \tau d\mathcal{H}^2 = \int_{Q^+} v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx + \int_{Q^+} \mathrm{curl} v \varphi dx. \tag{A.17}$$

Using a similar argument in Q^- and noting that $Tv|_{Q^-}$ is a reflection of v, we deduce that

$$-\int_Q Tv \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx = \int_{Q^+} \mathrm{curl} v \varphi dx + \int_{Q^-} \mathrm{curl} Tv \varphi dx,$$

which implies $\mathrm{curl} Tv \in \mathcal{M}(Q)$, and $|\mathrm{curl} Tv|(\Gamma) = 0$.

Step 4. Finally, assume $v \in V(Q^+)$. We define Tv to be the reflection as in Step 3. Using Lemma A.1, we can find a sequence $\{v_k\} \subset V(Q^+) \cap C^\infty(Q^+)$ such that (A.1) and (A.2) hold. According to (A.17), we can define $(v_k)_\tau$ as the limit of $(v_k^\epsilon)_\tau$ in the sense of weak convergence of measures. Let φ be as in Step 3. For any $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and any k and l, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Gamma (v_k)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2 - \int_\Gamma (v_l)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2\right| \le{}& \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_0^\epsilon \left|\int_\Gamma (v_k)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2 - \int_\Gamma (v_k^t)_\tau \varphi^t d\mathcal{H}^2\right| dt \\ &+ \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_0^\epsilon \left|\int_\Gamma (v_l)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2 - \int_\Gamma (v_l^t)_\tau \varphi^t d\mathcal{H}^2\right| dt \\ &+ \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_0^\epsilon \left|\int_\Gamma (v_k^t)_\tau \varphi^t d\mathcal{H}^2 - \int_\Gamma (v_l^t)_\tau \varphi^t d\mathcal{H}^2\right| dt.\end{aligned} \tag{A.18}$$

By (A.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Gamma (v_k)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2 - \int_\Gamma (v_k^t)_\tau \varphi^t d\mathcal{H}^2\right| &\le \left|\int_{Q^+\setminus Q_t^+} \mathrm{curl} v_k \varphi dx\right| + \left|\int_{Q^+\setminus Q_t^+} v_k \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx\right| \\ &\le C\left(\|\mathrm{curl} v_k\|_{L^1(Q^+\setminus Q_t^+)} + \|v_k\|_{L^2(Q^+\setminus Q_t^+)}\right) \\ &\le C\left(\|\mathrm{curl} v_k\|_{L^1(Q^+\setminus Q_\epsilon^+)} + \|v_k\|_{L^2(Q^+\setminus Q_\epsilon^+)}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{A.19}$$

Also we have

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_0^\epsilon \left|\int_\Gamma (v_k^t)_\tau \varphi^t d\mathcal{H}^2 - \int_\Gamma (v_l^t)_\tau \varphi^t d\mathcal{H}^2\right| dt \le \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{Q^+\setminus Q_\epsilon^+} |v_k - v_l|\,|\varphi| dx. \tag{A.20}$$

For all ϵ sufficiently small, by taking the supremum over all test functions that are compactly supported in $Q^+ \setminus \overline{Q_\epsilon^+}$ in (A.9), we obtain

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \|\mathrm{curl} v_k\|_{L^1(Q^+\setminus Q_\epsilon^+)} \le |\mathrm{curl} v|(Q^+ \setminus \overline{Q_{2\epsilon}^+}).$$

Therefore, by first letting $k, l \to \infty$ and then letting $\epsilon \to 0$, we deduce from (A.18)-(A.20) that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Gamma (v_k)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2$ exists. Define

$$\int_\Gamma (v)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2 = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Gamma (v_k)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2. \tag{A.21}$$

The above definition of $(v)_\tau$ does not depend on the sequence $\{v_k\}$. Using (A.1), (A.2), (A.17) and (A.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_{Q^+} v \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx = -\lim_{k\to 0} \int_{Q^+} v_k \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \left(\int_{Q^+} \mathrm{curl} v_k \varphi dx - \int_\Gamma (v_k)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2 \right) \\ &\le \liminf_{k\to\infty} |\mathrm{curl} v_k|(Q^+) - \int_\Gamma (v)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2 \\ &= |\mathrm{curl} v|(Q^+) - \int_\Gamma (v)_\tau \varphi d\mathcal{H}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since Tv in Q^- is a reflection of v, the traces of $Tv|_{Q^+}$ and $Tv|_{Q^-}$ in the sense of (A.21) agree on Γ. It follows that

$$-\int_Q Tv \cdot \hat{\nabla}^\perp \varphi dx \le 2|\mathrm{curl} v|(Q^+).$$

Taking the supremum over all φ with $\sup |\varphi| \le 1$, we conclude that $\mathrm{curl} Tv \in \mathcal{M}(Q)$, and $|\mathrm{curl} Tv|(Q) \le 2|\mathrm{curl} v|(Q^+)$. On the other hand, we have $|\mathrm{curl} Tv|(Q) = |\mathrm{curl} Tv|(Q^+) + |\mathrm{curl} Tv|(Q^-) + |\mathrm{curl} Tv|(\Gamma) \ge 2|\mathrm{curl} v|(Q^+)$. Therefore, it is clear that $|\mathrm{curl} Tv|(\Gamma) = 0$. □

Combining Lemmas A.1 and A.2, we obtain Proposition 2.2.

References

[1] S. Alama, L. Bronsard and E. Sandier, *On the Lawrence-Doniach model of superconductivity: magnetic fields parallel to the axes*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., 14 (2012), pp. 1825-1857.

[2] S. Alama, L. Bronsard and E. Sandier, *Minimizers of the Lawrence-Doniach functional with oblique magnetic fields*, Comm. Math. Phys., 310 (2012), pp. 237-266.

[3] G. Alberti, S. Baldo and G. Orlandi, *Variational convergence for functionals of Ginzburg-Landau type*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 54 (2005), pp. 1411-1472.

[4] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco and D. Pallara, *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2000.

[5] P. Athavale, R. L. Jerrard, M. Novaga and G. Orlandi, *Weighted TV minimization and applications to vortex density models*, preprint (arXiv:1509.03713).

[6] S. Baldo, R. L. Jerrard, G. Orlandi and H. M. Soner, *Convergence of Ginzburg-Landau functionals in three-dimensional superconductivity*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 205 (2012), pp. 699-752.

[7] S. Baldo, R. L. Jerrard, G. Orlandi and H. M. Soner, *Vortex density models for superconductivity and superfluidity*, Comm. Math. Phys., 818 (2013), pp. 131-171.

[8] P. Bauman and Y. Ko, *Analysis of solutions to the Lawrence-Doniach system for layered superconductors*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 37 (2005), pp. 914-940.

[9] P. Bauman and G. Peng, *Analysis of minimizers of the Lawrence-Doniach energy for superconductors in applied fields*, preprint (arXiv:1404.2008).

[10] S. J. Chapman, Q. Du and M. D. Gunzburger, *On the Lawrence-Doniach and anisotropic Ginzburg-Landau models for layered superconductors*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 55 (1995), pp. 156-174.

[11] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, London, 1992.

[12] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Classics in Mathematics, reprint of the 1998 ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.

[13] T. Giorgi and D. Phillips, *The breakdown of superconductivity due to strong fields for the Ginzburg-Landau model*, SIAM Review, 44 (2002), pp. 237-256.

[14] V. Girault and P-A. Raviart, *Finite Element Methods for Navier-Stokes Equations*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics 5, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.

[15] Y. Iye, *How anisotropic are the cuprate high T_c superconductors?*, Comments Cond. Mat. Phys., 16 (1992), pp. 89-111.

[16] R. L. Jerrard and H. M. Soner, *The Jacobian and the Ginzburg-Landau energy*, Calc. Var., 14 (2002), pp. 151-191.

[17] R. L. Jerrard and H. M. Soner, *Limiting behavior of the Ginzburg-Landau functional*, J. Funct. Anal., 192 (2002), pp. 524-561.

[18] W. Lawrence and S. Doniach, *Theory of layer structure superconductors*, Proc. 12th Inter. Conf. on Low Temperature Physics, pp. 361-362, Academic Press of Japan, Kyoto, 1971.

[19] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty, *A rigorous derivation of a free-boundary problem arising in superconductivity*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4), 33 (2000), no. 4, pp. 561-592.

[20] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty, *A product-estimate for Ginzburg-Landau and corollaries*, J. Funct. Anal., 211 (2004), no. 1, pp. 219-244.

[21] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty, *Vortices in the Magnetic Ginzburg-Landau Model*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications 70, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2007.